

HISTORY OF INDIA

(MODERN PERIOD)

BY

Prof. L. MUKHERJEE, M.A.,

Author of 'A Study of English History', 'A Study of Greek History' (in English & Bengali), 'A Study of Roman History' (in English & Bengali); 'History of India' (Hindu Period), 'History of India' (Medieval & Modern), 'A Hand Book of Modern Europe', 'A Study of European History' (1645—1815), 'A Study of Modern Europe & the World' (1815—1939), 'The Reign of George III', 'The History of the Victorian Period', 'Bharater Itihas' (in Bengali), etc, etc

EIGHTEENTH EDITION

MONDAL BROTHERS & COMPANY LIMITED

EDUCATIONAL PUBLISHERS

54-8 COLLEGE STREET, CALCUTTA

1899

All rights reserved

Price Rs.

FOREWORD

Of late years many learned monographs have been published, which have thrown new light on some of the aspects of Indian History. Besides, under altered circumstances our historical perspective has changed and so the history of our country requires to be studied from stand-points somewhat different from what was customary before. Hence the need has arisen of revising the author's previous work on the subject so as to make it up-to-date. A large portion of the book has been re-written and it has been considerably enlarged by the addition of new topics. Of these the most important are the socio-religious movements of the period and India's struggle for, and attainment of, independence. The requirements of the college students of Indian Universities have been steadily kept in view and for this purpose the standard text-books on the subject have been duly consulted. Embodying, as it does, the most authoritative opinions on the subject the present volume, it is hoped, will form a dependable compendium calculated alike to stimulate the interest of the students and to help them in preparing for their examinations.

The author's previous work comprised both the ~~Muslim~~ and British periods of Indian history in one volume. But as considerable additions to each period have been made in the course of revision, it has been thought necessary to divide the book into two parts. This, it is hoped, will make each volume handy and will suit the requirements of students of different universities which prescribe different periods in their syllabuses.

L. Mukherjee

CONTENTS

BOOK I

	PAGE
Introduction	ix—xi

CHAPTER I

Coming of the Europeans—Discovery of the sea-route to India—Portuguese settlements—Albuquerque—Causes of the decline of the Portuguese—The Dutch in the East—The East India Company—Quarrel with the Dutch—Quarrel with the Portuguese—Company's war with Aurangzeb—The United Company—French settlements.	1—9
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER II

Section I.—Rise of the British power in the Deccan—Southern India on the eve of the Anglo-French conflict—Respective position of the English and the French—First Carnatic War—Dupleix—The Second Carnatic War—Third Carnatic War—Causes of French failure—Estimate of Dupleix. .. .	10—17
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Section II.—Rise of British Power in Bengal—Siraj-ud-daula—The Black Hole—Clive and the Battle of Plassey—Mir Jafar—Mir Kasim—Battle of Buxar—Clive's reforms—Clive's Oudh policy—Diwani and Double government—Bengal after Clive's departure—Rise of Haider Ali—The First Mysore War. .. .	18—32
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Warren Hastings—His reforms—His Oudh policy—the Rohilla War—The Regulating Act—Hastings and the Council—Nanda Kumar—Council and Supreme Court—The First Maratha War—Treaty of Salbai—Second Mysore War—Affairs of Chait Singh—Begums of Oudh—Character and estimate of Hastings—Pitt's India Act—Macpherson. .. .	33—53
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Lord Cornwallis—His Reforms—The Cornwallis Code—The Permanent Settlement, its merits and defects—Third Mysore War—Sir John Store—Policy of Non-intervention—Mahadaji Sindhia. .. .	53—62
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Lord Wellesley—His policy—Subsidiary Alliance—Foreign policy—The Fourth Mysore War and death of Tipu Sultan—Wellesley's annexations—His Oudh policy—Wellesley and the Marathas—Second Maratha War—Achievements of Wellesley—Nana Fadnavis. .. .	63—74
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Lord Cornwallis again—Sir George Barlow—His policy of non-intervention—Mutiny of Vellore. .. .	75—76
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Lord Minto—Relation with the Sikhs—Ranjit Singh—Foreign Missions and naval expeditions—Charter of 1813 .. .	76—80
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Marquess of Hastings—War with Nepal—The Pindari War—Third Maratha War—Fall of the Maratha power—British supremacy in Rajputana—Internal reforms—Review—Relation of the Company with the Marathas—Causes of the fall of the Marathas 80—89

Lord Amherst—First Anglo-Burmese War—Capture of Bharatpur 89—91

CHAPTER III

Epoch of Reforms—Lord Bentinck—His administrative and Social Reforms—English as the medium of instruction—Relation with Ranjit Singh—Charter Act of 1833—Raja Ram Mohan Roy. Sir Charles Metcalfe—History of the Indian Press. 92—98

Lord Auckland—Afghan policy and the First Afghan War—Lord Ellenborough—Criticism of Afghan policy—Conquest of Sind—War with Gwalior. 99—104

Lord Hardinge—His reforms—The First Sikh War .. 104—106

Lord Dalhousie—Second Sikh War and annexation of the Punjab—Second Burmese War—His annexation policy—Doctrine of Lapse—Criticism—Annexation of Oudh—Reforms of Dalhousie—Educational Despatch of 1854—Charter Act of 1853—Estimate of Dalhousie 107—115

Lord Canning—War with the Persians—The upheaval of 1857—Was it a Mutiny?—Causes of the Mutiny—End of the Company—The Queen's Proclamation—Causes of the failure of the Mutiny—Results of the Mutiny—Company's policy towards Indian States. 115—123

CHAPTER IV

India under the Crown—Canning's policy—Constitutional changes—Indian Councils Act of 1861—Reforms—Lord Elgin—Sir John Lawrence—Afghan policy.

Section II.—Afghan policy 1857—1894.

Section III—Lord Mayo—Lord Northbrook—Lord Lytton—Second Afghan War—Lord Ripon—His reforms—Local Self-government—Ilbert Bill agitation 123—147

CHAPTER V

Awakening of India—Socio-religious movements—Raja Ram Moha—Brahmo Samaj—Prarthana Samaj—Arya Samaj—Ramakrishna Mission—Vivekananda—Theosophical Society. 148—158

Section I—Dawn of Nationalism—Sir William Jones—Asiatic Society—Political background of National Movement—Beginning of Political Agitation—Surendra Nath Banerjee—Birth of the Congress—Official attitude—Programme of the Congress. 158—166

CONTENTS

PAGE

Muslim Politics—Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan—A'igarh Movement—The Muslim League	161—164
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Section II—Lord Dufferin—Annexation of Upper Burma—Internal Reforms—Lord Lansdowne—Afghan affairs—Social legislation—Indian Councils Act of 1892—Lord Elgin—Military administration—Troubles in North-West Frontier—Lord Curzon—Foreign policy—Tibetan policy—Internal administration—Partition of Bengal—Cause of his resignation	164—177
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Progress of National movement—Ilak—Swadeshi Movement—Rise of the Extremist leaders	178—180
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Lord Minto—repression—Morley Minto Reforms—Indian Councils Act of 1909—Foreign affairs—Anglo Russian Convention—Lord Hardinge—Lord Chelmsford—The Government of India Act of 1919—Lord Reading—Non-Cooperation Movement—Lord Irwin—Effect of the First World War upon India	181—193
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

CHAPTER VI

National struggle since 1907—Change in Muslim Outlook—The Lucknow Pact 1916—Home Rule League	194—196
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Section I—Advent of Gandhiji—Massacre at Jallianwalla Bagh—Non-Cooperation Movement—Repressive measures—Swaraj Party—Gandhiji's March to Dandi—Gandhiji Irwin Pact—Repressive measures of Lord Willingdon—Communal Award—Poona Pact—Rift between Congress and League—Forward Bloc—The Second World War—Jinnah's two nation theory—Menace of Japanese invasion—Cripps Mission—The August Movement, 1942—Quit India Resolution—Netaji Bose and Ajit Hind Maz—Wavell Plan	197—209
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Last Phase of the Struggle—The Cabinet Mission—Direct Action by the League—The Great Calcutta Killing—Interim Government—Atlee's announcement—Mountbatten Plan—India divided—Indian Independence Act of 1947—India free but divided.	210—215
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Supplementary Notes—The Government of India Act of 1935—Constitution of Free India	215—230
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Tropical Analyses—British relations with Tibet—Relations with Afghanistan and North-West Frontier—The Indian States since the Mutiny—Fiscal policy since the Mutiny—Educational policy since 1854—Agricultural policy	231—250
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Appendix A—Growth of Indian Constitution—Growth of the Judicial system.	251—253
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------

Appendix B—Systems of land tenure	253—254
-----------------------------------	---------

	PAGE
Appendix C—Relation of the Company with Oudh—with the Nizam— with the Sikhs—with Mysore—Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan	254—257
Appendix D—Biographical Notes—Ranjit Singh—Haidar Ali—Tipu Sultan.	257—260
Select University Questions	260—263
Calcutta University Questions	263—264

BOOK I

CHAPTER I

COMING OF THE EUROPEANS

Discovery of the sea-route to India :—From time immemorial India carried on an extensive trade, both maritime and overland, with Europe. The products and manufactures of India were in great demand in western marts. This trade was particularly brisk during the first three centuries of the Christian era when the eastward expansion of the Roman empire facilitated commercial intercourse between the East and the West. But the old trade routes through Egypt and up the Persian Gulf through Syria, were closed in the seventh century when the Arabs conquered those countries. Thenceforward the bulk of the Indian trade was monopolised by the Arabs and it was they who carried the Indian merchandise to the markets of the Levant. A portion of the trade also passed across Central Asia to the shores of the Black Sea and on to Constantinople. But with the capture of Constantinople by the Turks the overland route was also closed. Thenceforth the eastern commerce became the monopoly of the Italian cities of Genoa and Venice, monopoly which they guarded with extreme jealousy. The other nations of Europe who had no ports on the shores of the Mediterranean, were thus shut out from participation in the lucrative trade with the East, and so they began to exert themselves to discover a non-Mediterranean sea-route to India. To Portugal belongs the credit of this discovery. Prince Henry of Portugal, surnamed the 'Navigator,' devoted his whole life to encouraging voyages for the discovery of the sea-route to India. Under his inspiration a succession of Portuguese sea-captains crept further and further down the western

Arab monopoly of the Indian trade.

The desire of the Europeans to have a share in the trade with the East.

shore of Africa. In 1487, **Bartholomew Diaz** was carried by storms past the Cape of Good Hope. His explorations pointed the way which, ten years later, was followed by another Portuguese navigator named **Vasco da Gama**. In 1497, he sailed from Portugal with three little ships and following the route of Diaz, doubled the Cape of Good Hope and reached Calicut in 1498. Thus was discovered the long sought-for sea-route to India.

Portuguese settlements:—Vasco da Gama was well received by the Raja of Calicut, known as the Zamorin. He did a little trade with friendly Hindu princes, but his arrival excited the opposition of the Arab traders and so he returned to Lisbon in 1499. The Portuguese lost no time in taking advantage of their discovery. They fitted out several other expeditions and established factories or trading stations at Calicut, Cochin and Cannanore. They encountered much opposition from the Arab merchants and in retaliation behaved towards them with revolting cruelty.

De Almeida :—Francisco de Almeida was the first Governor of the Portuguese possessions in India. His policy was to maintain the supremacy of the Portuguese on the sea and to confine their activity purely to commercial transactions. He completely discarded the idea of establishing a Portuguese empire in the East. This policy is known as the “blue water” policy.

Albuquerque :—The second and the greatest of the Portuguese governors was Alfonso de Albuquerque who succeeded De Almeida in 1499. He was an ambitious man whose policy it was to found a Portuguese empire in the East. He thus reversed the policy of his predecessor. His first act was to conquer Goa which became the headquarters of his administration (1510). Next year he conquered Malacca and, from that base, fitted out an expedition to explore the Spice Is-

He was the founder of the Portuguese power in India.

lands. His last great achievement was the conquest of Ormuz, an island in the Persian Gulf (1515). Thus, during his six years of governorship he firmly established the Portuguese on the mainland of India and made the Portuguese flag supreme on the Indian Ocean.

Conquest of Goa, Malacca and Ormuz.

Albuquerque proved himself a capable ruler. In his administration of Goa he freely utilised the services of Hindu officials and clerks and established schools for the education of the latter. But he was very cruel towards the Muslims and excluded them from office. He maintained the ancient Hindu village communities and enrolled native soldiers commanded by Hindu officers. An interesting feature of his administration was the abolition of *suttee* or the burning of widows on the funeral pyre of their husbands.

His administration of Goa.

Albuquerque sought to extend Portuguese influence in India by colonising selected areas with a mixed population formed out of the intermarriage of the Portuguese with Indian women. For this purpose he encouraged mixed marriages but this policy was a failure and resulted in the creation of a large class of degenerate Portuguese half-castes.

His policy of colonisation by means of mixed marriage.

The Portuguese empire and causes of its decline :—Throughout the sixteenth century the Portuguese were masters of the Eastern seas and had the absolute control of the Indian sea-borne foreign trade. In India their chief settlements were Goa, Daman, Diu, and Cochin. They had also occupied Ceylon, the Island of Socotra near the entrance of the Red Sea, Ormuz in the Persian Gulf, and Malacca in the Far East. In the poet's words it may be said that Portugal held "the gorgeous East in fee."

Extent of Portuguese possessions.

But the power of the Portuguese declined as quickly as it had risen. Their conduct provoked hostility and hatred on all sides. Their trading method was piratical and they derived as much pro-

Causes of decline.

(a) Cruelty of the Portuguese and their religious intolerance.

fit from plundering Arab ships as from legitimate commerce. Their officials were arrogant and corrupt and their treatment of the conquered people especially of the Muhammadans, was extremely cruel. Their attempt to force all people in their dominion to adopt Christianity produced widespread discontent and the atrocious persecutions which resulted from such insane attempts, made their very name odious to the people. A dominion founded upon such a policy cannot last long. But the event which contributed most to the decline of the Portuguese power in the East was the union of the crowns of Portugal and Spain under Philip II in 1580. This union not only made Portugal's interests subservient to those of Spain but dragged her into wars with the Dutch and English who were then at war with Spain. This European complication drained the resources of Portugal rendering that small country with its limited population quite unable to bear the strain of maintaining a distant empire in the East. What was worse, both the English and the Dutch began to make their appearance in the Eastern waters and Portugal had to yield before their rising maritime power.

(b) Rise of the Dutch and the English.

The Dutch in the East :—The first assault upon the Portuguese monopoly of the Eastern trade came from the Dutch. Having won their independence from Spain at the cost of much blood and suffering they felt the pulsation of a new life and entered upon a career of naval and commercial expansion. In 1598, they fitted out as many as five expeditions to trade with the East and some of these were extremely successful. Encouraged by their success they in 1602 amalgamated their private trading companies and formed the united East India Company of the Netherlands under the patronage of the State. From the first the Dutch directed their attention to controlling the spice trade and so they coveted the Malay Archipelago rather than the mainland of India. They easily

The Dutch were attracted more to the Spice Islands than to India.

overcame the opposition of the Portuguese whose settlements they attacked and occupied one after another. They conquered Java in 1619, and in 1623 they effectively checked English competition in the Malay Archipelago by the infamous massacre of the Englishmen at Amboyna. They captured Malacca from the Portuguese in 1641 and ousted them from Ceylon in 1658. These conquests gave them the control of the commerce of the Spice Islands. In India the principal Dutch strongholds were Nagapatam on the Madras coast and Chinsurah in Bengal, but they had many other minor settlements both on the Malabar and Coromandal Coasts. The Dutch possessions in India grew insignificant before the rising English settlements and were eventually conquered by the English. But the Dutch retained their supremacy in the Malay Archipelago.

Massacre of
the English
at
Amboyna.

Danish settlements :—The Danes also made an effort to share in the profits of Indian trade and formed an East India Company for that purpose. They founded a settlement at Tranquebar in the Tanjore district in 1620. Their most important settlement was at Serampore which they occupied about 1676. The Danes never made much impression on India and in 1845 they sold off their settlements to the British Government.

The East India Company :—The victory of the English over the Spanish Armada stimulated their maritime enterprise and urged them on to look for colonial and commercial expansion. The report of India's wealth spread by English and Dutch travellers, aroused in them a strong desire to share in the lucrative Eastern trade. So in 1590, a body of English merchants joined together to fit out an expedition to trade in the East and applied to Queen Elizabeth for a charter. In 1600, they obtained the charter and thereupon started the East India Company under the name of "the Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading into

Origin of the
Company.

the East Indies." The Company was given the exclusive right to trade with India for fifteen years.

Period of
separate
voyages.

Hawkins at
the Court of
Jahangir
and
Portuguese
opposition.

At first the Company organised 'separate voyages' in which each fleet was despatched by a particular group of subscribers who divided among themselves the profits arising from their venture. Joint-stock enterprises embracing the whole body of subscribers began in 1612. The first two voyages were directed chiefly to the Spice Islands. The English established a factory at Bantam and did some trade but encountered much opposition from the Dutch. The third voyage is memorable for the landing of *Captain Hawkins* at Surat where the first English Factory was established in 1608. Hawkins went to the Court of Jahangir, who received him favourably and granted the English permission to settle at Surat. But the concession was revoked under the pressure of Portuguese influence at the Moghul Court. Thus, with the Dutch opposition in the Malay Archipelago and Portuguese opposition in India, the position of the East India Company during the early stages of its existence was one of considerable difficulty.

In the Spice Islands (Malay Archipelago) the Dutch proved too strong for the English. In 1621, they violently expelled them from Pulo Run and two years later massacred a number of Englishmen at Amboyna. Since then English never seriously challenged the position of the Dutch in Malay Archipelago.

Defeat of the
Portuguese
off Swally.

But though ousted from the Spice Islands the English had better luck in store for them in India. Their prospects brightened up in 1612 when *Captain Best* defeated a Portuguese fleet off Swally near Surat. This victory damaged the prestige of the Portuguese and secured to the English an imperial *Farman* allowing them to establish a factory at Surat. Two years later the English won another naval victory over the Portuguese and in 1622 captured Ormuz from them with the help of the Shah of Persia. These victories weakened the

Capture of
Ormuz.

Portuguese power and henceforward the English had little to fear from their rivalry. In 1615, *Sir Thomas Roe* arrived in India as an ambassador to the Court of Jahangir from James I of England. He foiled the intrigues of the Portuguese at the Moghul Court and secured from Jahangir important trading privileges for his countrymen. The English followed up their advantage by establishing factories at various points on the coasts of India. On the Eastern coast their earliest trading stations were at Armagaon (1625) and Masulipatam. In 1640, the site of Madras was purchased from the Raja of Chandragiri and permission was obtained to build a fortified factory there which was named Fort St. George. In the meantime factories had been established in 1633, at Balasore and Hariharpur in Orissa. In Bengal, a factory was established at Hughli in 1651 by virtue of the privileges granted to the Company in return for the medical assistance rendered to the Subadar of Bengal by an English surgeon named Gabriel Boughton. In 1661, the Company obtained the Island of Bombay at the nominal rent of £10 a year from Charles II who had received it from the Portuguese as part of the dowry of his wife, Catharine of Bargaña.

Embassy of
Sir Thomas
Roe.

Foundation
of Madras.

Acquisition
of Bombay.

About 1658, a dispute concerning customs duties arose between the English traders of Bengal and Nawab Shayista Khan. Sir Josiah Child, the then Governor of the Company, was ambitious of territorial sovereignty in India, and took advantage of this quarrel to persuade King James II to declare war against Aurangzeb. An English expedition arrived at Hughli but failed to effect anything. The only result of his spirited war policy was the expulsion of the English from Bengal. Besides, the English factory at Surat was seized and Aurangzeb ordered all Englishmen to be driven out of his dominions. The English retaliated by attacking pilgrim ships sailing from Surat. Eventually terms of peace were arranged and the Eng-

Company's
war with
Aurangzeb.

Early history
of Calcutta.

lish were permitted to return. Job Charnock, the English agent at Hughli, had since 1686 been trying to establish a factory on the site of Calcutta. The hostility of Shayista Khan had prevented him from realising his object. But after the conclusion of the peace he secured Aurangzeb's permission and established a factory on the site of Calcutta in 1690. Six years later the place was fortified and named Fort William. About 1700, the Company purchased the villages of Sutanati, Kalikata and Govindapur and the city which began to grow on the sites of these villages, came to be known as Calcutta.

The Company further legalised its status by securing *Farmans* or signed privileges from the Emperor Farrukhsiyar. Many important concessions were granted by the Emperor as a reward for the medical service rendered to him by an English surgeon named William Hamilton.

Opposition
from rival
companies.

Growth of the United Company :—The monopoly of Eastern trade enjoyed by the Company aroused much opposition in England and as early as 1635 a rival company was formed by Sir William Courten under a licence from Charles I. After a ruinous competition the two companies were amalgamated in 1649. The position of the Company became prosperous since 1661 when its charter was renewed and King Charles II granted it the right to coin money, exercise jurisdiction over English subjects in the East and make war and peace with non-Christian peoples. But some thirty years later, the Company's monopoly again excited vehement opposition which resulted in the formation of another rival Company. The new Company did all it could to thwart the old Company which was brought to the brink of ruin. The competition between the two bodies was bitter and undignified till 1702 when a compromise was effected. The final settlement took place in 1798 when by the award of Godolphin all disputed points were set at rest and the two companies were amalgamat-

Union of
the rival
companies.

ed under the title of the "United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies." This United Company is better known as "The Honourable East India Company" and it continued its corporate existence down to the Sepoy Mutiny (1858).

N.B.—Note the difficulties of the East India Company during the seventeenth century: (1) In the Malay Archipelago the Company had to face the bitter hostility of the Dutch who eventually ousted them from the Spice Islands. (2) In India, the Portuguese did all in their power to thwart the English by open warfare as well as by intriguing with the Moghul Emperors and their provincial governors. (3) At home the monopoly which the Company enjoyed often aroused much opposition, which on two occasions led to the formation of rival Companies. As a matter of fact during the first hundred years of its existence the Company had many a struggle to maintain its corporate existence and the continuity of its trade.

Early difficulties of the Company.

French Settlements :—The French were late in making their appearance on the Indian coasts. Their early efforts, indeed, dated from 1604 but they all failed. At last in 1664, Colbert, the Minister of Louis XIV, succeeded in establishing a French East India Company (*La Compagnie des Indes*) on a firm footing. The French founded Pondicherry on the Madras coast in 1674 and it soon became a flourishing settlement. Other French settlements were Chandernagore in Bengal acquired in 1688, Mahe, Karikal and Yanaon. The French enterprise in India suffered much for want of adequate support from home.

CHAPTER II

RISE OF BRITISH POWER IN THE DECCAN

SECTION I

Circumstances which favoured the English.

Southern India on the eve of the Anglo-French conflict :—Towards the close of the first quarter of the eighteenth century the Mughul Emperor had lost all control over Southern India. Asaf Jah (Nizam-ul-Mulk), the Subadar of the Deccan, had practically made himself independent of Delhi (1724). But his supremacy in the Deccan was challenged by the Marathas under Baji Rao, and a long duel ensued between the two powers. The Carnatic was a province under the Subadar of the Deccan and was ruled by a governor, called the Nawab, with his capital at Arcot. But the Nawab was practically an independent ruler owning only a nominal submission to the Deccan. The political affairs of the Carnatic presented a scene of disorder and confusion. It was exposed to the plundering raids of the Marathas and troubled by disputes over the question of succession. These political convulsions in the Carnatic as well as the Nizam's preoccupations with the Marathas prevented the local powers from taking any serious notice of the quiet, imperceptible growth of the English and French settlements in the South. Both the English and the French plied their commerce peacefully and kept on good terms with the Nizam.

Respective position of the English and the French on the eve of the Carnatic Wars

The English Company was more wealthy and energetic.

The English Company was by far the wealthier body and drove the more vigorous trade. It had the advantage of being a private corporation and so its affairs were in no way interfered with by the State. This freedom from State interference left the Company ample opportunities for the dis-

play of individual energy and resourcefulness. The French Company, on the other hand, was more the "offspring of State patronage than the outcome of spontaneous mercantile activity." The bureaucratic control to which it was subject, allowed it comparatively little scope for the development of a spirit of enterprise and so the French settlements continued to be inferior to the British in strength, wealth and trade. In Pondicherry, the French indeed had a flourishing settlement but the English settlement of Madras was quite equal to it. But in Bengal, Calcutta completely dwarfed Chandernagore while on the West coast there was no French settlement that could compare with Bombay. Again, the French Company being poor, could not dispense with State subsidies and at times its affairs sank so low that the Crown was again and again obliged to come to its aid. Hence it was a burden rather than a source of profit to the nation. The English Company, on the other hand, was in no way financially dependent on the State; on the contrary, it was rich enough to advance loans to the Government. The country, therefore, benefited by its profits and so the Company came to be looked upon as a national enterprise. The French Company had no such national backing.

The French Company was a burden to the nation.

Anglo-French conflict in the Carnatic :—The first struggle between the English and the French in India was an echo of the War of Austrian Succession which broke out in Europe in 1740. England and France were ranged on opposite sides in that war and their hostilities in Europe spread to India as well. Troubles began in 1746 when an English fleet appeared on the Coromandal coast and threatened Pondicherry. Dupleix, the French Governor, secured the withdrawal of the fleet by appealing to Anwar-ud-din, the Nawab of the Carnatic. Pondicherry being thus rendered secure from attack, a French fleet under La Bourdonnais attacked and captured Madras. The French Cap-

First Carnatic War.

The French captured Madras, but restored it.

tain, however, promised to restore the city on payment of a heavy ransom. But Dupleix repudiated this engagement and seized Madras. He sought to follow up his success by an attempt to capture fort St. David but an English officer, Stringer Lawrence, repulsed the French attack. The English then made a naval attack on Pondicherry but were repulsed with heavy loss. In 1748, the war was brought to a close by the treaty of Aix-la-chapelle by which France, much against the wish of Dupleix, restored Madras to the English in exchange for Louisbourg in North America.

Ambition of Dupleix :—During the first Anglo-French conflict an incident occurred which had great influence on the subsequent history of India. Dupleix had secured the sanction of Nawab Anwar-ud-din in his attack upon Madras by promising to make over the city to him after its capture. When Madras fell into his hands, he refused to keep his promise and so Anwar-ud-din sent a large force to enforce his claim. But to the surprise of all, a handful of French troops completely routed his vast army at *Mailapur* or *St. Thome* in 1746. The importance of the battle lies in the fact that it revealed the helplessness of the ill-disciplined Indian army against a small body of trained Europeans. Dupleix profited by this lesson, and his ambition began to soar high as soon as the war with the English came to a close. He perceived that in the rivalries of the local princes his small but well-disciplined army might play a decisive part. This would ensure French supremacy in the courts of the Indian princes whose influence he might utilise in ousting the English from India. This was the grand idea which he began to cherish. Henceforth he began to look for opportunities to extend French influence by calculated interference in the internal quarrels of the Indian states.

Battle of St. Thome.

Policy of Dupleix.

Renewal of the Anglo-French conflict:—Dupleix's opportunity came soon. In 1748, the

aged Nizam, Asaf Jah, died and his vacant throne became the bone of contention between his second son, Nasir Jang, and his grandson (daughter's son), Muzaffar Jang. This dispute was complicated by a similar contention in the Carnatic. There Chanda Sahib, the son-in-law of a former Nawab, contested the claim of Anwar-ud-din who had been appointed Nawab by the late Nizam, Asaf Jah. The situation exactly suited the policy of Dupleix. His plan was to install Chanda Sahib as the Nawab of Arcot and then with his help to place Muzaffar Jang on the throne of the Deccan. This would make French influence supreme both in the Deccan and the Carnatic. Dupleix concluded a secret alliance with Chanda Sahib and Muzaffar Jang and the combined armies of the allies fell upon Anwar-ud-din who was defeated and killed at Ambur in 1749. Muhammad Ali, the illegitimate son of Anwar-ud-din, was driven to take refuge at Trichinopoly and the rest of the Carnatic passed into the hands of Chanda Sahib.

Fearing the extension of the French influence in the Deccan, the English took up the cause of Muhammad Ali and Nasir Jang, the respective rivals of Chanda Sahib and Muzaffar Jang. Thus, although the English and the French were at peace in Europe, an unofficial war broke out between the two nations in India as the result of their interference in Indian politics. Nasir Jang with the assistance of the English defeated Chanda Sahib and forced him to fall back on Pondicherry. He also captured Muzaffar Jang and thus for a time upset the plans of Dupleix. He, however, was soon murdered and the French immediately installed Muzaffar Jang as the Nizam. Shortly after Chanda Sahib was made Nawab of Arcot. Thus the French succeeded in placing their own nominees on the thrones of the Deccan and the Carnatic, and Dupleix's dream of empire seemed likely to be realised. After a short time Muzaffar Jang was killed in a skirmish but the French general Bussy placed his own nominee, Salabat Jang,

Dupleix
interferes in
the disputed
succession in
the Deccan
and the
Carnatic.

The Second
Carnatic
War.

French
influence
supreme in
the Deccan.

on the throne and thus maintained French influence in the Deccan.

The English
supports
Muhammad
Ali against
Chanda
Sahib.

Hitherto the English had given but half-hearted support to their allies but the success of the French awakened them to a sense of danger. Henceforth they determined to render effectual help to Muhammad Ali who was closely besieged by Chanda Sahib at Trichinopoly. The situation at Trichinopoly was hopeless, for the force at the command of the English was quite inadequate for its relief. At this juncture **Clive**, who had come out as a writer in the Company's service, evolved a plan for the relief of Trichinopoly. He suggested an attack upon Arcot as a means of creating a diversion and forcing Chanda Sahib to raise the siege of Trichinopoly. His plan was approved and Clive made a bold dash for Arcot and occupied it without opposition. This had the desired effect. The fall of his capital alarmed Chanda Sahib and compelled him to send away a large portion of his army from Trichinopoly to attempt the recapture of Arcot. Clive maintained a gallant defence for fifty-three days after which he was reinforced by troops from Madras and was also helped by the Marathas under Morari Rao. Thus the table was turned upon the French. Trichinopoly was relieved. Clive's further success at Kaveripak completed the discomfiture of the French. Chanda Sahib was forced to surrender to the Raja of Tanjore who had him treacherously murdered. Muhammad Ali then became the undisputed Nawab of the Carnatic. Thus Dupleix's high hopes were dashed to the ground.

Clive seizes
Arcot to
relieve Tri-
chinopoly.

Recall of Dupleix :—The Governments of both England and France disapproved of the policy of their subjects fighting in India while the two nations were officially at peace in Europe. The French Government sent Godeheu to supersede Dupleix who was recalled and left to die in poverty and disgrace. Godeheu then arranged terms of peace with the English by which both the nations

agreed not to interfere in the quarrels of Indian princes and to renounce all Muhammadan offices and titles. Both the nations retained their respective positions, the only concession contemplated being that the English should receive a town in the Northern Circars, the whole of which Bussy had managed to secure. Bussy, however, remained in the Deccan and maintained French influence there.

Fall of the French power in India :—With the outbreak of the Seven Years' War in 1755 the English and the French in India again became involved in hostilities. Thereupon Clive promptly captured Chandernagore. The French Government sent *Count de Lally* to India with the object of attacking English settlements in Southern India. Lally had some success in the beginning, He captured Fort St. David and other small places but failed in an attack on Tanjore. He then made a great mistake in recalling Bussy from the Deccan in order to marshal his forces for an attack on Madras. This ill-judged policy resulted in the loss of the French influence in the Deccan. Clive took advantage of the situation and sent Colonel Forde to the Northern Circars. Forde defeated Bussy's successor at Condore and stormed Masulipatam. At this turn of events the Nizam, Salabat Jung, went over to the English and ceded the Northern Circars to them. Lally then launched an attack on Madras but the town was protected by a British fleet. He was forced to retire to Pondicherry and was eventually defeated by Sir Eyre Coot at the decisive battle of **Wandiwash** in 1760. He retreated to Pondicherry which he gallantly defended for some time but was starved into surrender. The fortifications and buildings of Pondicherry were destroyed and the death-knell was sounded of French dominion in India. Lally returned to France where he was condemned and executed. This French settlements were restored by the

**The Third
Carnatic
War.**

**Defeat of
Lally at
Wandiwash.
1760.**

Peace of Paris with the reservation that they were not to be fortified.

Why Lally failed—his character.

N.B.—Lally was hot-headed and intolerant of advice. Besides, he knew nothing of Indian politics. Hence he made grave mistakes of policy specially in recalling Bussy from the Deccan. He alienated all by the violence of his temper and so was badly supported by the Pondicherry Government. This together was the apathy of the home Government in France accounts for the failure of his campaigns. Personally he was brave as a soldier and incorruptible as a man. He was condemned and executed as a traitor, a condemnation wholly unjust and undeserved.

The English Company was richer and better organised.

Causes of French failure :—The collapse of the French power in India was, to a large extent, due to the commercial superiority and better financial position of the English Company. The English never forgot that they were primarily a trading body and all through the war they busily transacted their ordinary commercial affairs. The French figures, on the other hand, showed a considerable decline and Dupleix came to the conclusion that for France the Indian trade was a failure. Hence he devoted his energies to military conquests and territorial expansion. This subordination of mercantile interests to territorial ambition was a cardinal error. It impoverished the French Company, which became a burden to the Government rather than a source of profit. Hence the Home Government in France, entangled as it then was in wars in Europe and America, was not in a position to support the ambitious schemes of Dupleix. *Secondly*, the French had no suitable military base in India, whereas the possession of Bengal, besides being a source of wealth to the English, gave them a firm base of operation on the mainland. *Thirdly*, the naval superiority of the English was an important factor in this contest for supremacy. English success on the mainland was seconded by success at sea. Hence the English were in a position to bring a constant supply of men and stores which the French could not. *Lastly*, the French Company lacked "the spirit of bold, individual and corporate effort" so often exhibited by the English. The English Company being a private cor-

France subordinated mercantile to territorial ambition.

France lacked a military base.

Naval superiority of the English.

poration, displayed considerable energy and individual initiative and was free from the deadening effects of detailed state interference. The French Company, on the other hand, was nothing more than a subordinate department of the Government. The shareholders being assured a fixed dividend, took no active interests in the fortunes of the Company. Hence its affairs were badly managed and it never became a flourishing concern. The Government on many occasions had to relieve its financial position but it could not do so indefinitely. The European complications of France proved a heavy drain on the exchequer and the Government had more imperative calls on its purse than financing a bankrupt company. These were the causes which contributed to the ill success of the French and the process of decline was hastened by Lally's mistaken policy.

Want of individual enterprise and initiative.

***Estimate of Dupleix:**—Dupleix is, beyond doubt, a striking figure in Indian history. For a time he raised the prestige of France in India to an amazing height and his interference in the Deccan would have shattered the English hopes there, if the French Government had supported him. He was a capable administrator and his political conceptions were daring and imaginative. His grand schemes failed because, unsupported by the Home Government he could not adjust them to the limited resources at his command. He was indeed prone to tortuous intrigue and unscrupulous in money matters, but in these respects his conduct was not worse than that of his European contemporaries in India. His successful and much bepraised rival, Clive, was equally unscrupulous and was more greedy and extortionate. Dupleix served his country with sincere earnestness and spent his private fortune in furthering its cause.

Section II

RISE OF BRITISH POWER IN BENGAL

Nawabs of Bengal:—In 1705 Murshid Quli Jafar Khan was appointed Governor of Bengal by Aurangzeb. Subsequently he was made Subadar of Orissa also. He transferred his headquarters from Dacca to Murshidabad which henceforth became the capital of Bengal. During the weak rule of Aurangzeb's successors Murshid Quli Khan practically became an independent ruler and founded a new dynasty of Nawabs in Bengal. On his death in 1727 his son-in-law, *Shuja-ud-din Khan* succeeded him in the government of Bengal and Orissa. Bihar was also added to his viceroyalty and he appointed Alivardi Khan as its Deputy Governor. He died in 1739 and was succeeded by his son *Sarfraz Khan*. But he was not destined to rule long. A conspiracy was organised against him and Alivardi Khan defeated and killed him at Gheria in 1740 and usurped the *masnad* of Bengal.

Alivardi Khan.

Alivardi Khan legalised his usurped position by securing an imperial *farrman* from Delhi. He was a man of considerable ability and great natural shrewdness. But throughout the greater part of his reign he was troubled by the unceasing raids of the Marathas who ravaged Bengal with terrible cruelty. At last he was compelled to purchase peace by the cession of the province of Orissa to Raghuji Bhonsle and by a promise to pay to the Marathas twelve lakhs of rupees a year as the *chauth* of Bengal. Freed from the Maratha troubles Alivardi tried to put his house in order and ruled wisely. He kept on good terms with the English but did not allow them to fortify their settlements except as a defensive precaution against Maratha raids.

Siraj-ud-daula:—Alivardi Khan died in 1756. He had three daughters whom he had married to the three governors of Dacca, Purnea and Patna.

But all his sons-in-law had predeceased him. Alivardi had designated his favourite grandson Siraj-ud-daula (son of his youngest daughter) as his successor. Accordingly on his death Siraj ascended the throne of Bengal (1756). But peaceful sucession is rare in Muslim history. Siraj's title was challenged by his cousin, Shaukat Jang, a son of Alivardi's second daughter. He rose in revolt at Purnea and his claim was supported by Ghasiti Begum, the eldest daughter of Alivardi, and by her all-powerful Diwan, Rajballabh. To add to his troubles Siraj found that his enemies were looking to the English for help and that the attitude of the latter was definitely hostile to his accession. He knew the game which the English had recently played in the politics of the Carnatic and feared a repetition of it in Bengal. Hence besides the enmity of his rivals and their partisans he had good reasons to be apprehensive of the designs of the English.

Siraj's
difficulties.

Siraj-ud-daula was a young man, scarcely twenty-four years old, and was somewhat self-willed and self-indulgent. But at first he displayed commendable energy and promptitude in disconcerting his enemies. He removed Ghasiti Begum to his own palace and kept her under surveillance. Next he marched towards Purnea to crush Shaukat Jang but soon turned back as the impertinent conduct of the English in Calcutta demanded his immediate attention.

The attitude of the English towards Siraj ever since his accession was one of studied disrespect. They thought that he would be soon ousted from his throne and so they courted the favour of the party opposed to Siraj. They gave him offence by abusing their trade privileges and by sheltering Krishna Das (Rajballabh's son) who was a fugitive from the Nawab's Justice. Lastly, they were adding to their fortifications without the Nawab's permission under the pretext of dangers likely to arise from the impending outbreak of the Seven

Causes of
Siraj's
quarrel with
the English.

Years' War. Siraj, suspicious of their design, ordered the English to dismantle their recent fortifications. He sent envoys to Calcutta to remonstrate, but they were treated with arrogant contempt. This impertinence roused Siraj to fury. He seized the English factory at Kasimbazar, marched upon Calcutta and captured it. The English prisoners, 145 in number, were, it is said, confined in a small room for the night and in the morning it was found that only 23 survived. This incident is known as the **Black Hole Tragedy**.

The so-called
Black Hole
Tragedy.

Did the
Black Hole
Tragedy
ever take
place ?

N.B.—Of late there has been much discussion as to whether the Black Hole Tragedy ever took place. The contemporary Muslim accounts, viz., *Siyar-ul-mutakherin* and *Riyaz-us-Salat* do not mention the event. Some scholars, both Indian and European, regard the whole story as a mere fabrication meant to arouse the resentment of the English against the Nawab. At any rate this much is certain that Siraj-ud-daula had no hand in this black affair, and the crime, if there was any, was committed by some of his irresponsible subordinates without his knowledge and permission.

Relief
expedition
under Clive
and Watson.

Recapture of
Calcutta.

Peace with
the Nawab.

When the news of the disaster in Calcutta reached Madras, a fleet under Admiral Watson conveying the troops under Clive's command was immediately despatched. The English fugitives at Futla were relieved and Calcutta was recaptured. Siraj-ud-daula once more led his army against Calcutta and a sharp but indecisive engagement was fought (1757). After this a peace was concluded between the Nawab and the English by which the privileges of the Company were restored and the English were permitted to fortify Calcutta. The Seven Years' War having broken out the English captured Chandernagore from the French after a spirited resistance.

Conspiracy
against
Siraj.

Hardly was the ink of the treaty dry when Clive chose to fight the Nawab with the weapon of political intrigue. Siraj-ud-daula's rule was unpopular and the disaffected nobles of the court headed by Mir Jafar, brother-in-law of Aliwardi Khan, were engaged in a secret plot to overthrow the young Nawab. Mir Jafar was the

Commander-in-chief of Siraj-ud-daula's army. He aspired to the throne and opened negotiations with Clive, who readily took the questionable course of supporting the plot against Siraj with whom the Company had recently concluded a treaty. One false step inevitably led to others. The negotiations were conducted through a banker named Aminchand (Omichand) who threatened to divulge the whole plot unless he was paid 30 lakhs of rupees. Clive descended to the meanness of preparing two drafts of the treaty with Mir Jafar, one false containing a promise to pay Aminchand's demands, and the other genuine which contained no such stipulation. Watson, who unlike Clive, was an honourable man, refused to sign the false document. whereupon Clive deliberately caused his signature to be forged. The false document with the forged signature was shown to Aminchand. Mir Jafar stipulated to pay to the English 175 lakhs of rupees besides compensation for losses as the price of their help.

Clive's
forgery.

When the plot was ripe Clive picked a quarrel with Siraj-ud-daula and marched northwards at the head of his army. He found the Nawab's army entrenched at **Plassey** where a battle was fought in which Clive obtained a cheap victory (1757). It was a mere skirmish "magnified into a battle on account of its political consequences." It should be noted that the great part of the Nawab's forces commanded by the traitor Mir Jafar never came into action. The Battle of Plassey made the English supreme in Bengal and in a sense ensured their paramount power in India. Siraj-ud-daula fled from the field but was captured and put to death by Mir Jafar's son, Miran. After the battle Clive saluted the traitor Mir Jafar as the Nawab of Bengal and installed him on the *masnad* of Murshidabad. The new Nawab had to pay an enormous sum of money to the English, amounting to nearly two and three-quarter millions. Clive's share of the booty was £334,000.

Battle of
Plassey.

Results.

Mir Jafar
was made
Nawab of
Bengal.

The Dutch
were crushed
at Bidderra.

Defeat of the Dutch:—The sudden aggrandisement of the English excited the jealousy of the Dutch who entered into negotiations with Mir Jafar now growing restive under Clive's domination. Clive, determined to foil their intrigues, arranged an attack on them both by land and water. The Dutch fleet was defeated and captured in the river Hooghly while Colonel Forde defeated them on land at *Bidderra* near Chinsurah in 1758. Henceforth the Dutch ceased to interfere in Indian politics though they retained their commercial status.

Invasion of the Shahazada repulsed:—The same year (1759) the Shahazada, Ali Gohour, the eldest son of the Emperor Alamgir, revolted against his father and invaded Bihar with the help of the Nawab of Oudh. He advanced up to Patna which he besieged but was defeated and repulsed by Clive. For this achievement Clive obtained from Mir Jafar an assignment of the revenue of the lands south of Calcutta, which was called Clive's *Jagir*. Next year Ali Gohour who now became Emperor Shah Alam, renewed his invasion but was again repulsed. Before the second invasion of Ali Gohour, Clive had sailed for England and was rewarded with an Irish peerage for his splendid services.

Misgovernment
in
Bengal due
to the
rapacity of
the
Company's
officers and
Mir Jafar's
incom-
petence.

Deposition of Mir Jafar:—Mir Jafar began his administration with heavy financial obligations to the Company. Besides, the huge 'presents' which he had to make to Clive and other officers of the Company, had so much crippled his resources that he found it impossible either to carry on the government or to pay off the Company's obligations. Hence the authorities at Calcutta determined to remove him, conveniently ignoring the fact that much of the misgovernment was due to their own greed and rapacity. Moreover, they felt sure that a new protegee placed by them on the *masnad* of Bengal, would make them handsome presents as Mir Jafar had done. Hence the Calcutta Council, headed by Vansittart who was ap-

pointed governor after Clive's departure, engineered another revolution, compelling Mir Jafar to abdicate in favour of his son-in-law, Mir Kasim. The dethronement of Mir Jafar whom the English "were bound to protect by the most solemn ties, divine and human", has been rightly stigmatised as an "indelible stain" on British character. The English promised military aid to the new Nawab, who was made to cede to the Company the districts of Burdwan, Midnapore and Chittagong and to make large 'presents' to the members of the Calcutta Council.

Mir Kasim:—Mir Kasim was a ruler of considerable administrative ability. Had he been given a fair chance he might have done much to restore good government in Bengal. But the dishonest officials of the Company would not allow any reforms to be introduced which were likely to prevent their unlawful acquisition of wealth. They wrongfully claimed the right to carry on private trade free of duties and enforced their claim with great injustice and oppression. This exemption crippled the resources of the Nawab and placed the Indian traders at a great disadvantage, and so Mir Kasim determined to put a stop to it. Finding that no justice could be had from the corrupt council at Calcutta he removed his court to Monghyr. He then abolished all transit duties and thereby placed the Indian and English traders on a footing of equality. This made the English furious and one Mr. Ellis, the English agent at Patna, retorted by seizing the city. Mir Kasim was thus driven to hostilities. He recaptured Patna and seized all the Europeans there. The rupture was now complete. The English marched against Mir Kasim and defeated him in successive engagements at Katwa, Gheria and Udaynala. Enraged at these defeats Mir Kasim ordered a massacre of the English prisoners at Patna and the order was carried out with great severity by a German adventurer nicknamed Sumroo who was in the

His quarrel with the British over transit duties.

Defeat of Mir Kasim at Gheria.

Massacre of the English at Patna.

Nawab's employ (1763). Mir Kasim fled and took refuge in Oudh. The English then brought back Mir Jafar and reinstated him as the Nawab of Bengal.

Defeat of the Nawab of Oudh at Buxar.

The cause of Mir Kasim was taken up by Shuja-ud-daula, the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh, and the Emperor Shah Alam, who had then taken refuge in the Nawab's court. But their combined forces were defeated by Major Munro at *Buxar* in 1764. This battle completed the work of Plassey and ensured British supremacy in Bengal and Bihar. The power of the Nawab-Wazir was broken and the titular Emperor Shah Alam sought British protection. Mir Kasim fled to the north-west where he died in obscurity.

***Importance of the battle of Buxar.**

It has been remarked that "Buxar deserves far more than Plassey to be considered as the real origin of the British power in India." The remark is true. Plassey was a mere skirmish and the victory of the English was due more to treachery than the superiority of the English arms. But Buxar was a straight fight in which the English demonstrated their military superiority and established their claim to be considered as the conquerors of Bengal. Plassey saw the defeat of an inexperienced Nawab surrounded by conspirators and betrayed by his own officers. But at Buxar the English defeated Mir Kasim, a veteran statesman supported by the greater power of Oudh. In the result the English not only tightened their grip over Bengal but ensured the safety of its north-west frontier.

Mir Jafar died in 1765. The Calcutta Council presided over by Vansittart, with indecent haste, installed a son of Mr. Jafar, named Nizam-ud-daula and received from him handsome presents in direct contravention of the orders of the Court of Directors.

Clive's second Governorship:—Alarmed at the notorious corruption of the English officials in

Bengal, the Court of Directors sent out Clive again as Governor of Bengal with full powers to reform the abuses in the Company's administration. Clive arrived at Calcutta in 1765 and immediately set to work to stem the tide of corruption. He had two tasks before him *viz.*, (a) to reform the abuses of the past and (b) to legalise the position of the Company by coming to an arrangement with the Emperor and the Nawab of Bengal.

Clive's reforms:—The abuses which needed reform were the receipt of presents by the Company's servants and the unlawful private trade which they habitually carried on. Clive forced the Company's servants to sign covenants forbidding them to receive presents or to carry on private inland trade. But the prohibition regarding the private trade was not strictly enforced, for an exception was made in favour of the senior servants. As their pay was very low, Clive sought to compensate them by forming a Society of Trade to which was granted the monopoly of trade in salt, betel-leaf and opium. The profits arising from it were to be distributed in graduated shares among the senior servants of the Company according to their rank. This arrangement was condemned and disallowed by the Court of Directors as it was a violation of their express orders forbidding private trade. So the Society was dissolved but its transactions were not closed till after Clive's departure.

Receipts of presents by Company's servants forbidden.

Society of Trade.

Clive's next measure was one of retrenchment. Ever since Plassey Mir Jafar had allowed an allowance called "*double batta*" to the military officers of the Company. The allowance, though granted to the officers on active service, was continued in time of peace. Now when the Company received the '*Diwani*' (see below), it became the paymaster and so it resolved to abolish the system. So Clive stopped the payment of the "*double batta*." This measure led to a mutinous combination among the

Abolition of the '*double batta*.'

Mutiny of the British officers suppressed.

English officers but Clive met the crisis with great firmness and promptitude and crushed the opposition.

Political arrangements : Foreign policy:—

Clive's Oudh policy.

Arrangement with the Nawab of Oudh.

He made Oudh a buffer state.

(a) The defeat of the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh and the Emperor Shah Alam at Buxar left both the potentates in the power of the Company. Oudh lay defenceless and Clive had it then in his power to march upon Delhi and occupy the imperial capital. The prospect was a dazzling one but the fact that Clive shrank from such a course speaks much for his statesmanship. A military conquest might have been possible, but to retain the distant provinces in those troublous times might have proved well-nigh impossible. Hence considerations of policy prompted Clive to deal leniently with the vanquished enemies. The Nawab-Wazir of Oudh was called upon to pay a war indemnity of fifty lakhs of rupees and was reinstated in all his possessions with the exception of the districts of Kora and Allahabad. Clive also concluded a defensive alliance with the Nawab-Vizier, by which the Company engaged to furnish him with troops on his consenting to pay the necessary cost. By this settlement with the Nawab-Wazir, Clive made Oudh a buffer state between the British and the Marathas and thereby ensured the safety of Bengal.

Diwani and Double Government :—

Clive's attitude towards Shah Alam.

Grant of the Diwani.

(b) Clive had next to deal with Shah Alam. He recognised the formal authority of the titular Emperor and tried to support him as far as possible. He made over to the Emperor the districts of Kora and Allahabad, which had been taken away from the Nawab-Vizier, for the support of his imperial dignity. He then persuaded the gratified Emperor to confer upon the Company the *Diwani* (i.e., the right to collect and administer the revenues) of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa in consideration of a yearly tribute of 26 lakhs of rupees.

By receiving the Diwani from the Emperor, Clive secured for the Company a recognised position and placed its status on a legal basis. Further, the acquisition of the Diwani by the Company was its first great step towards territorial dominion. Its results.

(c) Clive next made an arrangement with the Nawab of Bengal by which the English were entrusted with the military defence of the country while the Nawab was to receive fifty-three lakhs of rupees a year and to carry on the civil, criminal and police administration. This power, coupled with the grant of the *Diwani*, made the Company the supreme authority in the kingdom but the administration still continued to be conducted through native agency. The Company did not take over the task of collecting the revenue but left it in the hands of two Deputy Nawabs, Reja Khan in Bengal and Shitab Ray in Bihar. They were under the formal authority of the Nawab but were really controlled by the Company. This was the celebrated **Double Government** of Clive. Clive's Government. In practice, it proved a total failure, making confusion worse confounded. The Nawab was saddled with responsibility without power while the Company had power but would not undertake responsibility. The Nawab could not exercise effective control while the Company would not do it. None felt responsible for good government and so this faulty division of duties left the people helpless against oppression. The Company cared only for the collection of the revenue and abstained from interfering in the internal administration of the province. Hence the people were left to the tender mercies of the native revenue officers and the European supervisors, both of whom proved unscrupulous and tyrannical to a degree. In a word, power divorced from responsibility caused a recrudescence of the old abuses in a more intensified form. Defects of the Double Government.

But it should be noted that Clive's object in maintaining a show of Double Government was to

Clive's
motive in
setting up
the Double
Government.

disguise the real position of the Company and thereby to disarm the jealousy of the rival European powers. The open assumption of the Government of Bengal by the Company would have caused a breach with other European powers. Besides, there was another consideration. It was impossible for the Company to have taken over the full government of Bengal owing to the limited number of the Company's servants and their ignorance of the task of administration.

Political
merits of
Clive's
arrangements.

'Comment on Clive's political arrangements :

The policy which Clive adopted towards Emperor Shah Alam, the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh, and the Nawab of Bengal reveals a good deal of political wisdom and practical common sense. He invoked the shade of a great name and used the fiction of the Mughul sovereignty in order to regularise the Company's position in Bengal. By receiving the *Dicani* from the Emperor he consolidated British authority in Bengal and placed it on a legal basis. But he wisely refrained from trying to rehabilitate the Emperor and to make him a tool in the hands of the Company. Such a course would have involved the Company in endless wars. On the contrary he chose the safer course of making Oudh a buffer state and bound its ruler by ties of material interests. He thereby ensured the safety of Bengal and Bihar. In those troubled times the safety of Bengal was a far greater consideration than a precarious hold on Delhi. Lastly, his 'Double Government' of Bengal, although marked by serious defects, was an adroit measure to mask the real position of the Company. Its object was to delude the European rivals of the Company into the idea that the Nawab was still the *de facto* ruler of Bengal.

He was the
founder of
British rule
in India.

An estimate of Clive:—Clive left India in 1767 and on his arrival in England was severely attacked for his malpractices. The deception which he practised on Aminchand and his taking of huge

presents were severely criticised. But the House of Commons recorded their judgment in the words "that Robert, Lord Clive, at the same time rendered great and meritorious services to his country." This opinion, so far as it goes, is true. He had saved the critical position of the English in Madras by his gallant defence of Arcot and laid the foundation of the British power at Plassey. In a word, he raised a body of merchants to the position of a great territorial power in India. This was no mean achievement and Clive is justly entitled to praise for it. He had also done much to check the rapacity of the Company's officials. But when every tribute has been paid to the magnitude of his achievements, certain moral limitations must be noted. He was too greedy of riches and never scrupled to adopt base means for their acquisition. In the words of Colebrooke, his whole course of dealings with Mir Jafar was "stained with falsehood and treachery throughout." By engineering a revolution in Bengal he created a very unfortunate precedent which was closely followed by the Council on three successive occasions, on each of which the Company's servants, following his example, dipped their hands deep into the treasury of the Nawab. His second governorship though marked by many redeeming features was tainted by his unscrupulous proceedings regarding the Society of Trade. The establishment of that association in defiance of the positive orders of the Directors and in violation of his own express undertaking to abstain from private trade, was a shameful transaction which like some of his actions noted above, cannot be whitewashed. The admirable traits of his character were decision, iron will and gift for leadership. "He diagnosed a situation quickly, knew exactly what he wished to attain and directed his course thither relentlessly."

Clive's
achievements.

Bengal after Clive's departure:—The interval of five years that elapsed after Clive's final depar-

A period
of mis-
government.

Famine of
1770.

ture and the appointment of Warren Hastings was a period of distress and misgovernment. "Two men of mediocre abilities, Verelst (1767—69) and Cartier. (1770—72) bridged over the interval." Their administration was of little interest save for the demonstration of the failure of Clive's Double Government. The Company's officials returned to their evil ways and the people suffered much from their rapacity. The faulty division of duties prescribed by the Double Government made both the Nawab and the English criminally indifferent to the welfare of the people and resulted in neither party doing anything. To add to the misfortunes of the people, a terrible famine broke out in 1770 and carried off one-third of the population of Bengal. The Company's officials displayed shocking indifference to the sufferings of the people. Instead of trying to relieve their misery they made large profits by buying up rice and retailing it at high prices. The revenue was collected with great severity and was increased by ten per cent.

N.B.—Dr. Smith offers laboured excuses to whitewash the conduct of the Company's officials in connection with this famine although he is very severe in his criticism of Shah Jahan's conduct under similar circumstances. The students should note that Shah Jahan's conduct was much more noble and generous than the heartless conduct of the Company's officials.

***Rise of Haidar Ali:**—Mysore was originally a part of the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar. It became independent under a Hindu Raja of Wodeyar dynasty after the disaster which befell the Vijayanagar empire on the field of Talikota in 1565.

His early
career.

Haidar Ali was a most remarkable man of his time. He started his career as a soldier in the service of the Mysore state and by his military abilities soon rose to be the *Faujdar*, or commandant of Dindigul. Here he organised a body of troops and won his way to the post of the commander-in-chief of the Mysore Army. A treacherous palace intrigue drove him from office but he soon recovered his position and by the year 1761 became practi-

cally master of the Mysore state. He captured **His capture**
 Bednore, and the immense booty which he obtained **of Bednore.**
 there enormously increased his power. On the
 death of the Raja of Mysore in 1766 he increased
 his power still further and became the real ruler
 of Mysore although he went through the form of
 recognising a new Raja.

The rise of Haidar and his aggressive attitude **Haidar**
 excited the jealousy of the Marathas who inflicted **defeated by**
 a severe defeat upon him (1765). Haidar was **the Mara-**
 compelled to purchase peace by payment of a large **thas.**
 sum of money and by the surrender of his territory
 beyond the Mysore frontier. He, however, com-
 pensated himself by capturing Calicut and Malabar
 next year (1766).

The first Mysore War:—The rise of Haidar **Combina-**
 Ali was a source of danger to the neighbouring **tion against**
 powers and in 1766 the Nizam, the Marathas and **Haidar.**
 the English formed a strong coalition against him.
 To meet this combination was beyond Haidar's
 power. So he bought off the Marathas and detach-
 ed the Nizam from his alliance with the English.
 He then along with the Nizam attacked the Eng-
 lish but their combined forces were defeated by
 Colonel Smith at *Trinomalai Changama* in 1767.
 The fickle Nizam then deserted Haidar and joined
 the English who, however, in spite of their vic-
 tories, concluded a humiliating and ill-advised **The English**
 peace with the Nizam. By it the English agreed **make peace**
 to pay tribute to the Nizam for the Northern **with the**
 Circars and entered into an offensive and defen- **Nizam.**
 sive with him.

Though the Nizam took no further part in the **Haidar**
 war, hostilities continued with Haidar Ali who **dictates**
 laid waste the Carnatic and finally by a rapid **peace to the**
 march appeared within a few miles of Madras. **English.**
 The Madras Government was frightened into mak-
 ing peace on terms dictated by Haidar. The peace
 provided for the mutual restitution of conquests
 and reciprocal assistance in defensive war (1769).

The last clause involved the English in future difficulties. Thus ended the First Mysore War.

Haidar again
defeated
by the
Marathas.

In 1771, Haidar came in conflict with Marathas who invaded his territory. In accordance with the terms of the recent treaty, Haidar appealed to the English for help, but no help was forthcoming. By this conduct the Madras Government earned at once the bitter animosity of Haidar and incurred the discredit of repudiating its treaty obligations. Haidar was forced to pay the Marathas a large sum of money and to cede valuable territory (1771). Haidar never forgave the treachery of the Madras Government.

General Review

The period between 1756 to 1761 saw the transformation of the East India Company into a territorial power in India. The time was favourable for the English. India was then a mass of conflicting states not subject to any controlling power. The Moghul Emperor had shrunk into an insignificant figurehead, quite powerless to direct the course of events. The Marathas were trying to step into the place of the Moghuls and as a matter of fact they were the most formidable power on the eve of the British conquests. Their most determined enemy were the Afghans who under Ahmad Shah Abdali dealt a shattering blow at their power at the fateful field of Panipat in 1761. It was this battle which changed the fate of India by destroying any chance of Indian unity at that time. It shattered the Maratha power for a time, completely destroyed the Maratha unity and thus paved the way for the rise of the English. The English supremacy is generally dated from the battle of Plassey (1757) but it should be noted that Plassey was a mere skirmish compared to Panipat. Neither Wandiwash (1761) nor Plassey would have ensured British supremacy if the Marathas had come off successful at Panipat.

The year 1761 marks an important epoch in the history of India. It saw the disastrous defeat of the Marathas at Panipat and the complete ruin of the French hopes at Wandiwash. The same year saw the rise of Haidar Ali to a position of supremacy in Mysore. The first two events were favourable to the English but Haidar proved a serious menace to their position in Madras.

WARREN HASTINGS (1772—1785)

His early career:—Warren Hastings came out to Calcutta as a writer in the Company's service at the early age of eighteen. Soon after he was appointed Resident of Kashimbazar where he proved himself an able officer. When that place was captured by Siraj-ud-daula he was taken prisoner. He escaped and served under Clive with distinction. In 1761, he became a member of the Calcutta Council. He went home in 1764 and after five years came back as a member of the Council at Madras. In 1772, he was selected to succeed Cartier as Governor of Bengal.

His early difficulties:—Warren Hastings succeeded to a plentiful crop of troubles. The administration was in a state of chaos. The dual government had proved a failure and all the old forms of corruption had crept in again. The English servants of the Company had monopolised the trade of the country, while their native agents who collected the revenue, oppressed the people by their extortion. The revenue of the Company was defrauded, the treasury was almost empty and the currency in hopeless confusion. The courts of justice were a by-word while gangs of robbers infested the country.

Internal troubles.

Besides this misgovernment, there were other troubles ahead. The Marathas had recovered their power with surprising rapidity after their disaster at Panipat and were again making themselves prominent both in the North and the South. The

Difficulties as regards foreign relation.

Emperor Shah 'Alam had left the British protection and joined the Marathas. In the South, Haidar Ali was meditating revenge for what he considered to be the British perfidy, because the Madras Council refused to help him against the Marathas, as it was bound to do by treaty obligations (see p. 31).

***His administrative reforms:—**The administration of Hastings falls into two unequal divisions. The first period ranges from 1772 to 1774 during which as Governor of Bengal he was engaged in settling questions of internal reforms. The second period ranges from 1774 to 1785 during which he became Governor-General of the Company's possessions in India under the Regulating Act. It was during the first period (1772--74) when he was the Governor of Bengal that Hastings displayed a genius for "pioneering administration" and evolved order out of a chaotic state of affairs.

**End of
Double
Govern-
ment.**

**His revenue
arrangement.**

**English
Collectors
were ap-
pointed and
a Board of
Revenue
set up.**

(a) Hastings first turned to the question of settling the revenue. The Court of Directors having decided "to stand forth as Diwan" (*i.e.*, to collect the revenue through the agency of their own servants) Hastings removed from office Muhammad Reja Khan and Raja Sitab Rai who were respectively the Deputy Nawabs of Bengal and Bihar. These two officials were, under the orders of the Directors, prosecuted for peculation but were honourably acquitted. Hastings then entrusted the collection and supervision of revenue to the English officials called Collectors, who were to preside over the revenue courts in each district. A Board of Revenue was established and the treasury was transferred from Murshidabad to Calcutta. Hastings next made a quinquennial settlement of the land revenue granting farming leases to the highest bidders for five years. This was replaced in 1777 by annual settlements.

(b) Hastings established a civil and a criminal court in each district. The English Collectors

dispensed civil law while the criminal courts were presided over by the Indians. He also set up two courts of appeal in Calcutta, viz., the *Sadr Diwani Adalat* for civil cases and *Sadr Nizamat Adalat* for criminal cases. The former was presided over by the President assisted by two members of the Council and the latter by an Indian judge. He thus laid the foundation of the system of civil administration quite distinct from the commercial organisation which till now prevailed.

Establishment of courts of justice.

(c) *His financial measures* :—Hastings cut down the stipulated allowance of the Nawab of Bengal to one-half. He discontinued the tribute payable to the Emperor Shah Alam, as the latter was now in the hands of the Marathas. He then took away the districts of Allahabad and Kora from the Emperor and sold them to the Nawab of Oudh for fifty lakhs of rupees.

Allowance of the Nawab of Bengal cut down and that of Shah Alam stopped.

***Oudh Policy of Hastings:**—Hastings like Clive wanted to make Oudh a strong buffer state between the Marathas and the British provinces. The progress of the Marathas in the North portended danger to the British territories, and the control which they had secured over the Emperor Shah Alam aggravated the situation. In view of the possible hostile attitude of the Marathas, Hastings decided to keep on good terms with the ruler of Oudh and to strengthen his position so that he might be a barrier against the Marathas. In 1772, he concluded the *Treaty of Benares* by which he sold Kora and Allahabad to the Nawab-Wazir (Shuja-ud-daula) for fifty lakhs of rupees. It was also agreed that on the Nawab-Wazir's paying a subsidy, the Company was to lend him the aid of British troops whenever required. It was his Oudh policy which involved Hastings in the Rohilla War.

His policy was to make Oudh a buffer state.

Treaty of Benares.

Criticism :—The Oudh policy of Hastings (Treaty of Benares) and his treatment of the Emperor Shah Alam have been the subject of severe criticism. The discontinuance of the tribute to the Emperor and the snatching away of Kora and Allahabad

Justification of the Treaty of Benares and Hastings' dealings with Shah Alam.

given to him by Clive, are, it is said, very drastic actions involving breach of treaty obligations. But the conduct of Hastings may be justified on the ground that Shah Alam had forfeited his rights by leaving British protection and going over to the Marathas, the potential enemies of the Company. "To permit the Marathas to occupy Kora and Allahabad was to surrender the outworks of Bengal to the enemy; to continue paying the Emperor's subsidy was to replenish their treasury." Hence Hastings's conduct may be supported on political grounds.

Causes of the Rohilla War.

The Rohilla War:—From about 1770 the Marathas frequently raided the territory of Rohilkhand and the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh also coveted that rich province. To ward off the Maratha menace the Rohilla chiefs sought the assistance of the Nawab-Wazir and concluded a treaty with him in 1772. By the terms of the treaty it was agreed that if the Marathas invaded Rohilkhand the Nawab-Wazir should help the Rohillas in repulsing the invaders and should receive 40 lakhs of rupees as the price of his help. Early in 1773 the Marathas invaded Rohilkhand but retired when threatened by the combined forces of Oudh and the Company. The Nawab-Wazir demanded the stipulated sum but the Rohillas evaded payment. So he asked the English to lend him an English brigade to help him to conquer Rohilkhand. He promised to bear all the expenses of the war and to pay 40 lakhs of rupees to the Company. Hastings saw in this transaction an opportunity of replenishing the coffer of the Company and sent a brigade under Colonel Champion. The Rohillas were defeated at Miranpur Katra, their brave leader, Hafiz Rahama Khan, was killed and about 20,000 Rohillas were banished from the country. The Nawab's soldiers committed terrible atrocities. Rohilkhand was annexed to Oudh.

Criticism of Hastings's Rohilla Policy:—Hastings' policy with regard to the Rohilla War has been the subject of endless controversy and was one of the principal charges on which he was impeached. Two considerations prompted Hastings to lend the aid of British troops to the ruler of

Oudh, *viz.*, (a) pecuniary advantages to the Company and (b) the strategic importance of Rohilkhand the possession which by the Nawab-Wazir would protect Oudh (and so also Bengal) from the attacks of the Marathas. These two objects were attained, and so judged by its results the policy of Hastings was successful. It may also be said in favour of Hastings that the Rohillas were unable to hold their own against the Marathas and if the latter could once have secured possession of Rohilkhand the safety of Oudh and also of Bengal would have been seriously menaced. Again, the Nawab-Wazir had a legal and technical case against the Rohillas for violating a treaty and the English were pledged to support the Nawab. But when every consideration has been paid to the extenuating circumstances it must be said that Hastings was singularly blind to the political immorality of the whole transaction. The Rohillas had done nothing to incur the Company's hostility and so Hastings in helping the Nawab to crush them must have laid himself open to the charge of having prostituted British arms for hire. Secondly, his action was against the instructions of the Directors who forbade the Company to engage in Indian warfare. Thirdly, it created an unfortunate precedent, *viz.*, the mercenary employment of British troops against a people with whom the Company had no quarrel. Lastly, Hastings, it is said, gave a reluctant assent to the Nawab's proposal in the hope that the occasion for armed help would never arise. But as P. E. Roberts points out that such a 'lame half hope, half belief' is not impressive as statesmanship.

The conduct of Hastings was politically expedient but morally indefensible.

***The Regulating Act, 1773:**—Ever since the battle of Plassey the conduct of Company's officers was marked by such greed and rapacity that it soon attracted the hostile notice of the people of England. The nation felt the need of some legislation in order to control the affairs of the Company.

Circumstances under which the Act was passed.

**Provisions
of the Act.**

A great outcry was raised in 1773 when the Company in its financial distress was forced to apply to the British Ministry for a loan of a million sterling. This caused a great sensation, for India was supposed to be fabulously rich. Committees appointed to report on the state of the Company's affairs, revealed awful mismanagement showing how individuals (like Clive) had acquired immense wealth at the expense of the Company and the inhabitants of India. The British Parliament thought it high time to interfere and in 1773 passed the famous **Regulating Act**. By it (a) the Directors were required to lay before the King's ministers copies of all material correspondence concerning the civil, military and revenue affairs of the Company. (b) The Governor of Bengal was to be the Governor-General of the Company's possessions in India and was to be assisted and controlled by a council of four members, the Governor-General having only a casting vote in the Council. (c) The Governor-General and the Council were to have controlling power over the other Presidencies in their relations with the native powers. (d) A Supreme Court of Judicature was set up at Calcutta consisting of the Chief Justice (*Sir Elijah Impey*) and three puisne judges.

**Defects of
the Act.**

The Regulating Act was the first legislative interference by the British Government in the affairs of India. It subjected the Company to a definite Parliamentary control. The Act, however, was defective in many points. It was a "half-measure and disastrously vague in many points." It did not clearly define the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, nor the law it had to administer, nor its relations to the Council. Hence arose constant conflicts between the Council and the Supreme Court. Another great defect was that the Council had the power to bring about a deadlock in the executive by out-voting the Governor-General who could not do anything if his decision was overruled.

Hastings and the Council:—Of the members of the new Council the three that came from England, viz., Clavering, Monson and Francis, assumed an attitude of open hostility to Hastings. The fourth member, Mr. Barwell, a servant of the Company, supported Hastings. Thus, for a time, all real power passed into the hands of the hostile majority. The first action of the new councillors was to condemn the Rohilla War. They recalled the British Resident, Mr. Middleton, whom Hastings had stationed at Lucknow. They took advantage of the death of the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh to cancel the existing treaties and forced upon his successor a new treaty increasing the subsidies to be paid by him for the use of Company's troops and compelling him to surrender to the Company the district of Benares. Hastings in vain pointed out the injustice and impolicy of the measure as it was a reversal of the Company's traditional friendship with Oudh. Lastly, the Councillors admitted the claims of the Begums of Oudh (mother and grandmother of the new Nawab) to the greater portion of the treasure left behind by the late Nawab-Wazir. But the most dangerous act of hostility to Hastings was the Council's entertaining of charges of peculation brought against Hastings by Raja Nanda Kumar.

The Council condemned the Oudh policy of Hastings.

Hastings and Nanda Kumar:—The majority of the Councillors being hostile to Hastings, several charges of defalcation were brought against him and were welcomed by the Council. The most serious of these charges was that brought by Maharaja Nanda Kumar, a Brahmin of high rank and influence. In 1775 he laid a letter before the Council, charging Hastings with having received, among other bribes, a large sum of money from Muni Begum, the widow of Mir Jafar. Hastings refused to be tried before his own Council and when the majority persisted, he declared the Council dissolved. Next he retorted by bringing a charge of conspiracy against Nanda Kumar and

others. While this matter was still pending, Nanda Kumar was suddenly arrested at the instance of one Mohan Prasad on a charge of forgery. He was put on trial, condemned to death and executed.

Criticism :—The dramatic execution of Nanda Kumar coinciding in point of time with the charges he had brought against Hastings has given rise to endless controversy. The opponents of Hastings then and subsequently asserted that he had instigated the prosecution of Nanda Kumar in order to save his own position. The modern apologists of Hastings hold that this insinuation is baseless and that Nanda Kumar had a fair trial. We may accept the fact as true that Hastings had no hand in the matter and the judges decided the case impartially. But that does not prevent one from holding that there was a miscarriage of Justice. For as P. E. Roberts remarks: "It is very doubtful whether the Supreme Court had any jurisdiction over the natives, and there is practically no doubt at all that the English law making forgery a capital crime was not operative in India till many years after Nanda Kumar's alleged forgery had been committed." Nor were the charges brought against Hastings entirely groundless. The same learned author observes that it was a fact that Hastings had actually received 1,50,000 rupees from Muni Begum, a transaction which was directly opposed to the Company's express instructions against the receipt of presents. V. A. Smith conveniently ignores this point but even Sir James Stephen, the most stout defender of Hastings, is forced to characterise this transaction as "questionable."

The charge
against
Hastings
was not
baseless.

Hastings In Power:—In 1776, Colonel Monson died. His death gave Hastings and Barwell the powers of the majority by means of the Governor-General's casting vote. In 1777, Clavering made an attempt to seize the office of Governor-General on the ground that Hastings had tendered his resignation. Hastings declared that his agent in London to whom he had sent instructions, had exceeded his powers in tendering the resignation on his behalf and that his supposed resignation was not valid. The Supreme Court decided in his favour. The same year Clavering also died leaving Hastings completely free to pursue his own course of action. In 1780, Hastings wounded Francis in a duel and the latter left for England. Thus ended his unseemly quarrel with the hostile councillors.

Council and Supreme Court:—The undignified struggle between Hastings and his Council revealed one defect of the Regulating Act. Another of its defects was its failure to define the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and its relations to the Council, *i.e.*, the Executive. This led to a conflict of jurisdiction. It should be noted that besides the Supreme Court there were Company's Courts which were under the Council. There were frequent frictions and the executive administration was constantly hampered by the decision of the judges of the Supreme Court, who claimed to be superior to the Council. To put a stop to this quarrel between the Executive and the Judicature, Hastings made Sir Elija Impey the head of the Company's Courts by inducing him to be the President of the Sadr Diwani Adalat. Impey was to hold this new office besides his Chief Justiceship of the Supreme Court and was to receive a considerable addition to his salary. This arrangement worked well but was vehemently criticised, for it looked like a bribe offered to Impey to forego his opposition to the Council. It was disallowed by the Home Government and Impey was recalled. In 1781, Parliament passed an Amending Act defining the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as limited to Calcutta and to British subjects elsewhere and exempting the Governor-General and Council from its jurisdiction.

Conflict between the Council and the Supreme Court.

Hastings's measure to secure harmony.

The Amending Act of 1781 put a stop to the conflict.

N.B.—Dr. Smith gives a good character to Impey on the authority of Sir James Stephen. But the latter while defending Impey, disapproves of his acceptance of a post which compromised his independence. Smith does not mention this fact. P. E. Roberts remarks that Impey had an evil reputation in India and points out that Lord Cornwallis, who was not censorious and who never spoke anything against Hastings, was against Impey being again sent out to India.

Hastings's Foreign Policy:—Hastings wanted not so much to increase the Company's possessions as to consolidate and strengthen what it had already got. His one great aim was to secure the safety of Bengal by maintaining in Oudh a strong

Hastings
had to face
a very
critical
situation.

buffer state ; for this reason he helped the Nawab of Oudh in his designs upon Rohilkhand. He was also alive to the danger of possible French intervention in India as the French had taken up the cause of the revolted American Colonies. So he organised an overland service *via* Suez for rapid communication with Europe. But in spite of his non-aggressive policy wars were forced upon him by the mistaken policy of the Bombay Government and the blunders of the Madras Government. In the wars which followed—the first Maratha War and the Second Mysore War—Hastings showed energy, promptitude and great diplomatic power and managed to maintain British position at a time when England was fighting with her back to the wall, being engaged in hostilities at one and the same time with France, Spain, Holland and the revolted American Colonies.

Condition
of the Mara-
thas after
the third
battle of
Panipat.

Revival of the Marathas :—The imperialistic schemes of the Peshwa Balaji Rao were dashed to the ground in 1761 on the fateful field of Panipat. But the Maratha power recovered with surprising rapidity from the staggering blow. The fourth Peshwa, Madhava Rao I (son of Balaji Rao), was a very able ruler and made his influence felt in the Deccan by his successful warfare against the Nizam and Haidar Ali of Mysore. Mahadaji Sindhia, another Maratha chief, had made himself supreme in Agra and Delhi and brought the titular Emperor, Shah Alam, under his control (1771). But the death of Madhab Rao (1772) and the struggle that followed over the succession to the Peshwaship weakened the Marathas and broke up their unity. The power of the Peshwa declined and the independent Maratha Chiefs like Sindhia of Gwalior, Holkar of Indore, Gaikwar of Baroda and the Raja of Nagpur, rose to prominence. Thus the Marathas ceased to exist as a single power.

The first Maratha War :—The first Anglo-Maratha conflict arose out of the uncalled-for

interference of the Bombay Government in the internal quarrel of the Marathas. In 1772, Narayan Rao became Peshwa after the death of his brother, Madhava Rao. Shortly after, he was murdered at the instigation of his uncle, Raghoba, who aspired to the Peshwaship. But Raghoba was opposed by a rival party headed by Nana Fadnavis who took up the cause of the posthumous son of Narayan Rao. Thus thwarted, Raghoba applied to the English in Bombay and concluded with them the *Treaty of Surat* by which he agreed to cede to the Bombay Government Salsette and Bassien as the price of their help. The English quickly occupied Salsette and defeated the Marathas at Arras at a heavy cost in casualties. The English Council in Calcutta disapproved of the policy of the Bombay Government, and Hastings for once agreed with Francis in condemning the transaction as unjust and impolitic. But since the Bombay Government had committed themselves, Hastings sought to support them. But he was overruled and a fresh treaty was concluded called the *Treaty of Purandar* (1776) by which the English agreed to abandon the cause of Raghoba on condition of being allowed to retain Salsette. The Directors, however, approved of the treaty of Surat and Hastings decided to continue the alliance with Raghoba and to wage war in his favour.

The English took up the cause of Raghoba against the rightful claimant.

Treaty of Surat, 1775.

Treaty of Purandar, 1776.

In 1779 a British army advanced from Bombay towards Poona, but it was severely defeated at Telegaon and compelled to surrender. The English had to conclude the humiliating *Convention of Wadgaon* by which they promised to surrender Raghoba, to give British hostages and to restore all territories which the Bombay Government had acquired since 1773. Hastings repudiated the disgraceful convention and continued the war. He sent a strong army under Colonel Goddard to retrieve the disgrace. Goddard made a brilliant march across Central India, formed an

Defeat of the English and the Convention of Wadgaon

English
success in
central
India.

city of
Salbai, 1782.

alliance with Gaikwad of Baroda and with his help captured Ahmadnagar. He also took Bessein. Next he advanced towards Poona, but suffered a severe defeat at the hands of the Marathas, and had to fall back with heavy loss (1781). The English, however, fared better in Central India. Major Papham captured Sindhia's capital, Gwalior, with the help of Rana of Gohad who was Sindhia's enemy. General Camac also defeated Sindhia at Sipri. These reverses inclined Sindhia to make peace with the English and he undertook to negotiate a treaty between the English and the Poona Government. Hastings eagerly accepted his proposal as he found the Marathas too strong to be overawed by such forces as he could then bring against them. He was then carrying on war on two fronts—against the Marathas and Haidar Ali. This put a heavy strain on the finances of the Company. Hence Hastings welcomed Sindhia's mediation in making a general peace with the Marathas. The first Anglo-Maratha war was brought to a close by the famous *Treaty of Salbai* in 1782. By it the English restored all the territories which they had conquered since the Treaty of Purandar except Salsette which they retained. They recognised Madhab Rao Narayan as the rightful Peshwa and had to give up the cause of Raghoba who was pensioned off. Sindhia got back all the territories west of the Jumna. In other respects the *status quo* was maintained. It was also provided in the treaty that Haidar Ali was to be forced to give up the territories he had conquered from the Nawab of Arcot.

Hastings's Maratha policy was ill-advised. This costly war brought the English no gain beyond what was secured by the Treaty of Purandar. It exhausted the Company's treasury and drove Hastings to those arbitrary expedients of raising money which led to his impeachment. But though the material gains of the war were not impressive

the Treaty of Salbai which closed it was a good stroke of policy. It secured peace with the formidable power of the Marathas for twenty years and thus enabled the English to fight their other enemies under comparatively favourable conditions. In this respect it may be looked upon as a landmark in the history of British ascendancy in India. But the remark of Dr. Smith that the treaty "established beyond dispute the dominance of the British as the controlling factor in Indian politics" is overcoloured. Haidar Ali, a no less formidable enemy, had still to be reckoned with and the Maratha power was as yet unshaken.

Significance
of the
Treaty of
Salbai.

The Treaty of Salbai greatly enhanced the prestige of Mahadaji Sindhia. He utilised his new position to extend and consolidate his authority in Northern India.

*N.B.—Note how towards the end of 1780 the fortunes of the English in India, as Sir Alfred Lyall remarks had fallen to their lowest water mark. There was a formidable coalition of Indian powers against them. France had declared war in 1778 and was preparing a formidable expedition to recover their old prestige in India. Haidar Ali was carrying on successful operations in the Carnatic. It was the Treaty of Salbai that saved the English position by isolating Haidar Ali.

Affairs in Madras :—About this time the Madras Government was torn by internal dissensions and saturated with corruption. The 'Double Government' which recognised the Nawab as the ruler of the Carnatic, produced results as disastrous and inequitable as those which had marked similar arrangements in Bengal. The Nawab was entirely in the hands of the Company's servants who had lent him money at a usurious rate of interest. Those money-lenders dominated the Madras Council. The Nawab wanted to fill his coffers by annexing Tanjore and the Governor of Madras deposed the Raja without any pretext and handed over his kingdom to the Nawab, a shameful act for which he was dismissed by the Directors. The next Governor, Lord Pigot, restored Tanjore to the Raja but was imprisoned by his subordinates for

Madras was
a prey to
corruption.

his rather tactless opposition to their dishonest dealings. Thomas Rumbold who succeeded him was charged with corruption and was dismissed. These open scandals and constant changes in Government resulted in inconsistent and chaotic policy which alienated the Nizam and entangled the Madras Government in war. The annexation of the Guntur district by the English and the alliance which they had formed with 'Raghoba' offended the Nizam, who built up a strong confederacy embracing almost all the Maratha powers and Haidar Ali of Mysore. It was this confederacy which Hastings broke up by the Treaty of Salbai. He had before that conciliated the Nizam by restoring Guntur to him. Haidar alone remained in the field.

The English
captured
Mahe against
Haidar's
remons-
trances.

Second Mysore War :—In 1778, France having joined the revolted American colonies, England declared war against her. Thereupon the English in India seized the French settlements including Mahe, a port which was very useful to Haidar Ali for the entry of supplies. Haidar remonstrated against the seizure of Mahe by the English but in vain. The provocation thus given to him, added to his desire to take revenge on the English, for their refusal to help him against the Marathas in 1772 (see p. 31), prompted Haidar to declare war and he gladly joined the strong coalition formed by the Nizam in 1779 against the English. The war thus begun, lasted from 1780 to 1784.

Haidar's
success
against
Baillie.

Haidar Ali burst upon the Carnatic which he "swept with the broom of desolation." He surrounded an English brigade under Colonel Baillie and compelled it to surrender. Munro, the victor of Buxar, retreated in panic to Madras after flinging his artillery into a tank at Conjeeveram. In 1780, Haidar captured Arcot. Fortunately for the English, Haidar was left to fight alone. Hastings by skilful diplomacy won over the Nizam, concluded a treaty with Sindhia and bought off the

Raja of Berar. The coalition was thus broken up and Haidar had to continue the war alone. Hastings next sent an army from Bengal under Sir Eyre Coote, who defeated Haidar at *Porto Novo* in 1781 and retrieved the British prestige. The next engagement at *Polliore* was indecisive but at *Sholingur* Coote gained another minor success. The English then captured Negapatam and Trincomali from the Dutch, who had joined the European war against Britain. Here, however, the success of the English received a check. The hope of Haidar for a time rose high by the appearance of a French fleet under Suffrein who recovered Trincomali and kept the English busy at sea. Haidar took Cuddalore from the English while his son *Tipu* defeated and captured an English army under Colonel Braithwaite in 1782. At this juncture Haidar died to the great relief of the English.

Battle of
Porto Novo.

Sea fight
between the
English and
the French.

Death of
Haidar Ali.

After Haidar's death, his son Tipu continued the war. He was, however, deprived of French help because in 1783 England and France came to terms by the peace of Versailles. Tipu fought single-handed and captured Bednore and Mangalore. The war dragged on for some time with varying success on both sides till the Madras Government ended it by the **Treaty of Mangalore** in 1784. By it both parties agreed to a mutual restitution of conquests and exchange of prisoners. Hastings disapproved of the terms of the treaty as humiliating but was not in a position to withhold ratification.

End of the
Second
Mysore War.

The affairs of Chait Singh:—Since 1775 Benares had been transferred to the Company by the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh and so the Company became the overlord of Raja Chait Singh of Benares (see p. 39). In 1778, on the outbreak of hostilities with the French, Hastings demanded a special contribution of five lakhs of rupees from Chait Singh, over and above the ordinary tribute payable to the Company. Chait Singh paid the amount. Has-

Hastings'
demand of
war subsid-
ies from
Chait Singh

**Arrest of
Chait Singh
leads to riot.**

**Deposition of
Chait Singh.**

**Action of
Hastings
criticised.**

**The conduct
of Hastings
was cruel and
improper.**

tings repeated the demands in the two succeeding years, 1779 and 1780 and extorted payment in spite of the Raja's humble protests that his agreement with the Company exempted him from all contribution beyond the tribute. Some delay in making the last payment as well as the Raja's inability to furnish a contingent of horsemen demanded by Hastings led the Governor-General to regard Chait Singh as disloyal and contumacious. So he imposed upon Chait Singh a fine of 50 lakhs of rupees and himself marched to Benares to execute his plans of extortion. Chait Singh submitted humbly enough ; but Hastings proved inexorable and unjustly placed the Raja under arrest. Thereupon the troops of Chait Singh rose in arms and massacred a number of English sepoys with three officers. In the general confusion Chait Singh escaped and Hastings was forced to flee for safety to Chunar. The disturbances, however, were quickly suppressed. Chait Singh was deposed and his nephew installed in his place. The tribute payable by the new Raja was assessed at double the rate paid by Chait Singh.

Criticism :—Dr. Smith justifies Hastings's demands for exceptional war subsidies by the grave necessities of the situation, but admits that the Raja was treated with improper harshness. In other words, Hastings made expediency the rule of his conduct, regardless of moral considerations and treaty obligations. There was a definite agreement made in 1775 with Chait Singh that the Company would not on *any pretence* make any further demand upon him as long as he paid the stipulated tribute. 'Grave necessity' might be a convenient excuse for breaking solemn treaties but no such necessity existed for placing the Raja under arrest when his conduct all along had been extremely submissive. This was tyranny pure and simple and the conduct of Hastings, to say the least of it, was unjust, improper and high-handed. Moreover, the whole transaction was a sorry failure, for the money found in Chait Singh's treasury was plundered by the troops who were encouraged to do so by Hastings's letter.

Begums of Oudh :—The Chait Singh affair was a miserable failure. The Company got nothing by it. But money must be found anyhow, for the Company's treasure had been drained dry by the costly wars against the Marathas and Haider

Ali. Hence arose another 'grave necessity' of seeking out other victims of extortion. A large arrear of subsidy was due to the Company from the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh. In order to pay off his arrears the Nawab wanted to resume the *jagirs* and to recover the treasures held by his mother and grandmother, who were, known as the Begums of Oudh. It should be noted that the property and treasures held by the Begums were guaranteed by the Calcutta Council, though Hastings personally was opposed to such a pledge being given. On the pretext that the Begums had been implicated in Chait Singh's revolt, Hastings cancelled the guarantee and gave permission to the Nawab-Wazir to despoil the Begums. The Nawab hesitated to take proceeding against his near relatives and had to be screwed up by Hastings. British detachments were sent to Fyzabad to surround the Begums' palace, the Begums were placed in confinement and the two eunuchs who acted as their stewards, were forced, by imprisonment, fetters and infliction of the lash, to part with the hoarded treasure. With the money exacted in such a brutal manner the Nawab-Wazir's debt to the Company was cleared off.

The Nawab of Oudh wanted British help to despoil the Begums in order to pay off his arrears to the Company.

The Begums were plundered and their stewards roughly handled.

Criticism :—Hastings' treatment of the Begums of Oudh is an indelible stain on his character. His modern apologists put forward laboured excuses to justify his conduct. Thus Dr. Smith says that the 'urgent necessities of the time justified Hastings in cancelling treaty obligation and putting a certain amount of pressure on the Begums to make them disgorge.' While commenting on the severities practised on the Begums he says, that they were mild measures according to Indian practice, though not legitimate according to European standard and that Hastings had no personal knowledge of the nature of the severities practised. Such a flimsy defence befits a partisan and not one who poses as an impartial historian. It is not a fact as P. E. Roberts points out, that Hastings was ignorant of the nature of the coercion practised on the Begums and the eunuchs. Throughout this ignoble transaction Hastings was the moving spirit. It was he who egged on the wavering Nawab-Wazir and set his face against the use of gentler methods advocated by the two successive Residents, Middleton and Bristow. Secondly, the comfortable doctrine of "urgent necessities" is almost universally made use of by autocrats and their partisans to justify all sorts

Hastings was responsible for this ignoble transaction.

of high-handed proceedings. *Thirdly*, assuming that the severities practised were mild according to Indian practice, did not the Governor-General degrade himself by descending from the lofty 'European standard' to the dirty level of Indian practice? Smith sees nothing wrong about it. But P. E. Roberts points out that the temperately worded verdict of Sir Alfred Lyall is the mildest form of censure that meets the case. "The employment of personal severities, under the superintendence of British officers, in order to extract money from women and eunuchs is an ignoble kind of undertaking!.....to push him (Nawab) on and actively assist in measures of coercion against women and eunuchs was conduct unworthy and indefensible." Lastly, the statement of Hastings and his defenders that the Begums were acting in complicity with Chait Singh is quite false. P. E. Roberts points out that "the testimony to the facts is worthless, consisting of vague *ex post facto* statements of interested parties and hearsay evidence." Were it true, Hastings ought to have produced the evidence at the time and openly to have demanded satisfaction from the begums.

Sir Alfred
Lyall's view.

The Begums
were not
implicated
in Chait
Singh's case.

Retirement of Hastings:—The policy of Hastings was strongly criticised by the House of Commons in 1782 and in the following year the Court of Directors censured him for his conduct at Benares and in the affairs of the Begums of Oudh. When Pitt came to power in 1784, he also intimated his disapproval of the several features of the policy of Hastings. Finding himself abandoned by the ministry, Hastings resigned in 1785.

On his return to England he was at first favourably received. But three years later he was impeached for crimes alleged to have been committed by him during his period of office, such as corruption, acceptance of presents and bribes, oppression in the case of Chait Singh and the Begums of Oudh, etc. The trial began in 1788 and lasted till 1795 when he was acquitted on all the articles. The expenses of trial almost ruined his fortunes and saddened his old age.

His impeach-
ment.

Character and Estimate of Hastings

Hastings was a man of inflexible resolution and imperturbable patience. He steered the ship of the empire safely through a time of unexampled storm and stress and but for his energy and re-

Hastings's
achieve-
ments.

sourcefulness it must have foundered and gone done. The difficulties which he had to face throughout his administration were such as would have proved insuperable to any but a strong and able man. He came to office at a time when no government worth the name existed. To him must be given the credit of planning a system of administration which reduced the chaotic rule of the Company to an ordered government. He had to save the position of the Company from the serious perils to which it was exposed by the blunders of the Bombay and Madras Governments. His great achievement in this direction was the success with which he met the anti-British combination of the Southern powers, engineered by the Nizam in 1779. This entitles him to be regarded as the second founder of the British Empire in India. To these difficulties were added others created by the faulty Regulating Act. From 1774 to 1776 he was constantly harassed and outvoted by the hostile majority in the Council. Lastly, he had to find money for the empty treasury of the Company. To meet the financial difficulties he was driven to many questionable acts which have greatly tarnished his reputation. But in all these he was guided solely by patriotic motives without any thought of self-aggrandisement. He was naturally of a kind disposition but there was a touch of vindictiveness and relentlessness in his character which at times steeled his heart against the generous promptings of human nature.

His manifold difficulties.

He saved the British Empire at a critical period.

He was a man of varied activity. He knew Persian and Bengali well and took a warm interest in arts and literature. He encouraged the study of Sanskrit literature by European scholars, founded the Madrasah in Calcutta, established the Royal Asiatic Society and opened up a trade route with Tibet.

His varied activity.

Pitt's India Act of 1784:—During the closing years of Hastings's administration, Indian affairs

**Fox's India
Bill.**

absorbed a good deal of the attention of Parliament. In 1782 *Fox* brought forward his *India Bill* by which all political and military powers of the Company were transferred to a board of seven commissioners appointed at first for four years by Parliament and afterwards by the Crown. The Bill was passed by the Commons but was rejected by the Lords chiefly through the influence of the King.

**Pitt's Act
brought the
Company
under par-
liamentary
control.**

Pitt then carried his famous *India Act* in 1784. It placed all civil, military and revenue affairs of the Company under the supervision of the six "Commissioners for the affairs of India", commonly known as the Board of Control. This Board was composed of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, one of the Secretaries of the State and four Privy Councillors appointed by the Crown. In practice the real power of the Board was monopolised by the senior Commissioner who was known as the President of the Board of Control. The orders of the Commissioners were to be transmitted to India through a secret committee of three Directors of the Company. The Court of Proprietors was deprived of any right to annul or suspend any resolution of the Directors approved of by the Board. The effect of these provisions was to place the affairs of the Company in direct and permanent subordination to the British Parliament. Supreme authority passed out of the hands of the Directors who retained only their patronage, that is, the right to appoint and dismiss their own servants.

**of the
effects of
the Regulat-
ing Act
ved.**

The Act also introduced important changes in the Indian administration. The council of the Governor-General was to consist of three members and not four as provided for by the *Regulating Act*. Bombay and Madras were made definitely subordinate to Bengal in all questions of war, diplomacy and revenue. By clearly defining the authority of the Governor-General over the subordinate Presidencies the Act removed one of the

defects of the Regulating Act. A supplementary Act passed in 1786 removed another defect. The Governor-General was authorised in special cases to override the decision of the majority of the council and also to hold the office of the commander-in-chief. Lastly, it was laid down that "to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India are measures repugnant to the wish, the honour and policy of this nation." This principle was seldom acted upon and was honoured more in breach than in observance.

Pitt's India Act established a double government for Company's possessions in India, that of the Board of Control and that of the Company's Directors. This system remained in force till 1858.

Macpherson:—When Hastings left India Sir John Macpherson, the senior member of the Council, succeeded him as temporary Governor-General. His administration lasted twenty months during which he effected some financial economies. Mahadaji Sindhia had greatly increased his prestige by the part he had played in bringing about the Treaty of Salbai. He now got control of the titular Emperor and secured from him the government of the provinces of Agra and Delhi. So puffed up did he become with success that he demanded 'Chauth' from the British provinces. This was curtly refused by Macpherson. At this juncture Lord Cornwallis arrived in India as the permanent Governor-General.

Aggrandisement of Mahadaji Sindhia.

LORD CORNWALLIS (1786—1793)

Lord Cornwallis was an influential English peer and a man of high character. He was given special powers by an Act passed in 1786 by which he could overrule, for adequate reasons, the decision of his Council. He also enjoyed the confidence of the Ministry and the support of the Court of Directors. Hence he was in a position

His character and policy.

to pursue his own course of action unhampered by any factious opposition. He came out with the declared intention of avoiding war and devoting himself to the reform of the Company's service.

His administrative reforms

In internal affairs Lord Cornwallis introduced many useful reforms which touched almost every branch of administration. It has been said that "he laid the foundation of the present Indian Constitution". His reforms fall under three heads *viz.*, reform of the Company's service, re-organisation of the law-courts and judicial system and the permanent settlement of the land revenues of Bengal.

**Measures
against
official
corruption.**

Reform of the covenanted service :—Personally Warren Hastings might have been above corruption but there is no denying the fact that the "whole system of the government over which he presided was corrupt and full of abuses." Nepotism and corruption were rife among the Company's servants. They continued to carry on the forbidden private trade and enriched themselves by large unofficial perquisites. Their salaries were low while their commissions were large. Cornwallis put a stop to their commissions and placed them above the temptation of underhand dealings by increasing their official salary. At the same time he laid down stringent regulations for their conduct and saw to it that these regulations were strictly enforced. In this way he did much to purify the administration.

**Gradation of
civil courts.**

Judicial reforms :—"In the organisation of the Judicial Courts, civil and criminal, Cornwallis completed the work begun by Warren Hastings." He set up an ascending hierarchy of courts. The lowest courts, presided over by Indian Munsifs and *Sadr Amins*, tried petty civil cases. Above them were the *Zilla* or District Courts under a British Judge who was aided by Indian experts (*assessors*). Cornwallis also instituted four Provincial Courts

of Appeal at Calcutta, Murshidabad, Patna and Dacca. These Courts were presided over by three European Judges who were also aided by Indian assessors. They tried criminal cases and heard appeals from the District Courts. At the top of all these courts was the *Sadr Diwani Adalat* which was presided over by the Governor-General and Council and formed the final court of appeal.

The power of the Collectors was greatly reduced. They were divested of all judicial and magisterial powers and their duties were confined to purely revenue work. Thus the executive and judicial powers of the Company's servants were separated and vested in separate officers. Important changes were made in the administration of criminal justice. The criminal jurisdiction of the Deputy Nawab or Naib Nizam was abolished and judges from the four provincial courts were sent on circuit to try criminal cases within their jurisdiction. In criminal cases the highest court of appeal was the *Sadr Nizamat Adalat*. Moham-medan criminal law with slight modifications continued to be administered in criminal matters, but some of its grosser punishments, such as *impalement* and mutilation, were abolished. To protect the Indians from official oppression the Collectors and other officers of the Government were made amenable to the courts for acts done in their official capacities.

Collectors were divested of judicial powers.

Criminal justice was entrusted to European Judges.

For police administration districts were divided into small areas called *thanas* each under the charge of an Indian *Daroga* working under the supervision of the District Magistrate. The *zemindars* were thus deprived of the power and responsibility of maintaining peace within their jurisdiction and were forced to disband their police force.

Police administration.

N.B.—Note how Cornwallis deprived the Indians of all share in the administration. Till now the administration of the criminal justice and the duty of maintaining peace and order were in the hands of the Indians—the Naib Nazim and the *zemindars*. These duties were now transferred to European officers. Cornwallis Distrust of the Indians.

payment of revenue enforced by the sale law caused great hardship and ruined many zemindars. *Lastly*, the hope that was entertained that the zemindars would improve and develop their estates, had not been realised. To sum up, a settlement for a long term of years might have retained all the advantages of Permanent Settlement without its defects.

The results of the Permanent Settlement may be described as follows : In regard to the three interested parties—the Zemindar, the Ryot and the Ruling power—it “assured the welfare of the first, somewhat postponed the claims of the second, and sacrificed the increment of third.”

Foreign Policy:—Cornwallis was anxious to maintain peace and neutrality and to avoid entanglements with the ‘country powers’, *i.e.*, Indian States. He refused to assist the son of Shah Alam to recover his throne at Delhi, and warned Mahadaji Sindhia against interfering in the affairs of Oudh. But he was not able to avoid hostilities with Tipu Sultan. To fight Tipu he concluded an alliance with the Nizam and the Marathas.

Third Mysore War:—In 1788, Cornwallis obtained Guntur from the Nizam who in return asked for troops under the provision of the treaty of 1768 in order to recover certain of his former territories from Tipu Sultan. By the treaty of Mangalore (1784) concluded with Tipu, the English had recognised the latter's right to the districts now claimed by the Nizam. Cornwallis, however, to please the Nizam, agreed to lend him troops on condition that they should not be used against any powers in alliance with the Company. A list of the powers was added but the name of Tipu was deliberately omitted. This was not a fair dealing as it violated the treaty made with Tipu in 1784. Tipu became furious when he heard of this transaction and commenced hostilities by attacking

Cornwallis
provokes
Tipu by an
alliance with
the Nizam.

Tipu attacks
Mangalore.

Travancore, a state in alliance with, and under the protection of, the Company.

Cornwallis formed a triple alliance with the Nizam and the Marathas against Tipu. The earlier campaigns were unsatisfactory owing to the failure of the Madras authorities to provide supplies. In 1790, Cornwallis himself assumed the command. He captured Bangalore and defeated Tipu at Arikera but was forced through a shortage of supplies to destroy his heavy guns and to beat a hasty retreat. The timely arrival of the Marathas with ample supplies, however, saved the situation. In 1792, Cornwallis resumed operations, captured the hill-forts of Tipu and advanced upon Seringapatam, while the Marathas laid waste the Mysore territory. Tipu finding resistance hopeless came to terms. By the treaty of Seringapatam concluded in 1792, Tipu agreed to cede half of his dominions, to pay a large war indemnity and to surrender two of his sons as hostages. By this treaty the Company got Malabar, Coorg, Dindigul and Baramahal. The Marathas gained territory on the north-west, and the Nizam on the north-east, of Mysore.

Triple alliance against Tipu.

Treaty of Seringapatam closed the war.

Criticism:—Some critics urge that Cornwallis had it then in his power to complete the overthrow of Tipu and by doing that in 1792 might have saved another war which was left to Wellesley. But it may be said in his defence that the annexation of the whole of Mysore would have displeased both the Nizam and the Marathas, and he had good reasons to suspect treachery in both. Besides such a step would have offended the official opinion at home and contravened the policy of Pitt's India Act of 1781. Further war with France was imminent and Directors were clamouring for peace. *Lastly* Cornwallis "was not eager to take over the management of the whole country of Mysore and so deliberately stayed his hands."

Reasons why Cornwallis did not annex Mysore.

***An estimate of Cornwallis:**—The character of Cornwallis deservedly won for him universal respect. He purified the administration by waging incessant war against corruption and jobbery in every form. His most enduring works were the reorganisation of the covenanted civil service, establishment of the District Courts as the unit of

His permanent work.

administration and establishment of the Permanent Settlement in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. But the exclusion of Indians from high posts was a short-sighted measure. He was a good military commander and knew how to keep his subordinates under control. He retired from India in 1793.

1798

Renewal of Charter:—As the time for the renewal of the Company's Charter drew near a strong agitation was started against the retention of the monopoly of the Indian trade by the Company. In the end the Charter was renewed for twenty years and the small concession of 3,000 tons of shipping was allowed to the private traders every year (1793).

His Policy
of non-inter-
vention.

The Nizam
defeated by
the Marathas
at Khanda.

Sir John Shore:—Cornwallis was succeeded by Sir John Shore, his colleague and adviser, in forming the laud settlement of Bengal. Shore strictly followed the *Policy of Non-intervention* and carried it to a pitch which compromised the honour and prestige of England. Thus when the Nizam was attacked by the Marathas, he appealed to the English for help to which under the terms of his treaty he was entitled. Shore refused to intervene and the result was that the Nizam was signally defeated by the Marathas at the battle of *Khanda* in 1795. The Nizam was disgusted at the bad faith of the English and turned to the French officers for assistance to train his troops.

Bad effects
of the Policy
of Non-in-
tervention.

The Policy of Non-intervention was not politically expedient at this troublous period. Because it was sure that any ground of political advantage which the English would willingly abandon would be occupied by the enemy. Thus the effects of Shore's policy of Non-intervention were to increase the power of the Marathas, to cripple the power of Nizam, an ally of the English, and to lose the confidence of other allies. Moreover, the ambition of the other powers of India was heightened as they attributed this policy not to moderation but to weakness and selfish interest. Tipu was encouraged to make hostile preparations against the Company.

Oudh affairs:—In Oudh, Shore, contrary to his wont, acted with vigour. On the death of Asaf-ud-daula, the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh, he was succeeded by a reputed son of worthless character. Shore at first sanctioned the succession. But when he came to know that the reputed son was the offspring of a menial servant, he reversed his decision and set up a brother of the late Nawab on the throne. By a treaty concluded with the new Nawab, the Company undertook the defence of Oudh in return for an annual subsidy of 76 lakhs of rupees and the cession of the strategic position of Allahabad. Shore's Oudh policy was perhaps prompted by the possible danger from Zaman Shah, the ruler of Kabul, who had invaded the Punjab. The invader, however, was recalled to meet dangers near at home.

Shore interferes in the question of succession in Oudh.

Recall of Shore:—The reforms of Cornwallis gave rise to much discontent among the military officers as their unlawful gains were stopped. In 1795, occurred a dangerous mutiny of the European officers of Bengal who threatened to seize the administration. So serious was the situation that Shore was compelled to grant many concessions to the disaffected. For this weakness shown in dealing with the mutiny he was recalled towards the close of 1796. Shore on his arrival in England was created Lord Teignmouth.

Mutiny of Bengal officers.

Mahadaji Sindhia:—Mahadaji Sindhia was the most outstanding figure in Maratha politics during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. He had taken part in the third battle of Panipat where he was permanently lamed by a severe wound. He succeeded to his father's *jagirs* and soon became the most prominent of the Maratha chiefs. When Shah Alam, the titular Mughul Emperor, left British protection in 1771, Mahadaji took him under his wing and reinstated him on the throne of Delhi. This greatly increased his prestige and importance. He fought against the English during the first Anglo-Maratha conflict but was de-

He brought Emperor Shah Alam under his control.

feated. In spite of this, Warren Hastings thought it prudent to court his friendship and utilised his services in bringing about the Treaty of Salbai (1782). This greatly enhanced his influence, and his power grew rapidly. He got the Emperor completely under his control and obtained from him patents making the Peshwa Vicegerent of the Empire (*Vakil-i-Multug*) and himself the Peshawa's Deputy or *Naib*. He also secured for himself the command of the imperial army and the assignment of the *subahs* of Delhi and Agra as a guarantee for the pay of his troops. He thus controlled the entire region from the Sutlej to Agra and made the Marathas the supreme power in Hindusthan. Besides, he held valuable territory in Malwa and the Deccan and possessed a fine army trained and disciplined by De Boigne, a brilliant Savoyard military expert. He grew bold enough to demand *Chauth* from the British provinces but Macpherson, successor of Warren Hastings, curtly refused it.

His part in
the Treaty
of Salbai.

Extent of
his power.

His
troubles.

His
character.

Sindhia's ascendancy at Delhi provoked the jealousy of the Rajputs and the Afghan Rohillas and for a time he had to suffer vicissitudes of fortune. He was defeated by a coalition of Rajput powers in 1786 and was in the next year attacked by the Rohillas. In 1788 he temporarily lost his hold on Delhi, when Ghulam Quadir, a savage Rohilla chief, seized Delhi, plundered the palace and cruelly blinded the miserable Emperor Shah Alam. But he soon recovered his position. The Rajputs were defeated, Ghulam Quadir was caught and hanged and the Emperor restored. In 1792 Holkar challenged his authority, but was severely defeated. He then proceeded to Poona to establish his authority at the centre of the Maratha power and urged the Peshwa to form a closer connection with Tipu in order to check the growing British power. But before any definite action could be taken he suddenly died at Poona in 1794. His death was a relief to the English who watched his movements with suspicion, and left Nana Fadnavis

all-powerful in Maratha affairs. Grant Duff describes Mahadaji Sindhia as "a man of great political sagacity and of considerable genius, of deep artifice, of restless ambition and of implacable revenge." He was succeeded by his nephew, Daulat Rao Sindhia.

LORD WELLESLEY (1798—1805)

Lord Mornington, better known by his later title of Lord (Marquis) Wellesley, succeeded Sir John Shore. His period of office is one of the most critical and eventful in Indian history and marks the final stage in the struggle between the British and the Indian powers for supremacy. Wellesley was a good classical scholar and had served for several years as a member of the Board of Control.

State of affairs in India:—When Wellesley assumed office the growth of French influence in the courts and camps of Indian rulers was a serious menace to British power. This was, to a great extent, due to the weak policy of non-intervention pursued by his predecessor. Tipu was negotiating with the French Governor of Mauritius and Reunion, and French officers were preparing to drill his troops. The Nizam, estranged by Shore's desertion, was organising a body of regular troops under a French officer named Raymond. Sindhia had a powerful army trained and commanded by another Frenchman named Perron. The ascendancy of the French in the courts of Indian princes was a source of great danger especially in view of the fact that England was then engaged in the Revolutionary war with France and that Napoleon who had led an expedition into Egypt, cherished designs for the conquest of India.

The French
peril in
India.

Wellesley's policy:—Wellesley came out with two fixed ideas; one was to make the English the paramount power in India, and the other to crush for ever all French intrigues in the courts of the

His foreign
policy was to
exclude
French
influence.

Policy of
Non-inter-
vention
abandoned.

Indian princes. His ideas were imperialistic, in other words, his object was to extend British influence throughout India, for he was convinced of the superiority of the British rule to any form of Indian government. Hence he gave up the policy of Non-intervention and set his face against the idea of a balance of power by which his predecessors had sought to hold the Indian princes in check. To achieve this twofold object he boldly adopted the policy of annexation and subsidiary alliances. Small and weak kingdoms were to be annexed while the powerful states should be induced or forced to enter into Subsidiary Alliances. The **Subsidiary Alliance** involved the "subordination of the allied Prince to British government in external policy and foreign relations, the maintenance and payment of a contingent of Company's troops, and dismissal of the officers belonging to other European nations." In return for all these, the Company guaranteed the territorial integrity and internal freedom of the subsidiary state. In a word, the subsidiary state surrendered its political independence in return for British protection.

Defects of
Subsidiary
Alliance.

N.B.—Well-ley's policy of Subsidiary Alliances was vicious in principle. The allied prince being guaranteed in the possession of his dominions but deprived of the essentials of sovereignty, sinks in his own esteem and loses that stimulus to good government which is supplied by the fear of rebellion and deposition. He becomes a lax and a careless ruler. It has been observed by Sir Thomas Munro that "wherever the subsidiary system is introduced, the country will soon bear the marks of it in decaying villages and decreasing population." The truth of this remark is amply borne out by the case of Oudh where misgovernment became chronic although its ruler was repeatedly warned by several Governors-General.

Foreign policy:—The foreign policy of Wellesley was directed mainly towards combating French intrigues in India, actual or possible, and crippling the power of the Indian princes by inducing or forcing them to enter into Subsidiary Alliances. His attention was drawn to the three leading powers of the time, viz., the Nizam, Tipu,

and the Marathas. The first was induced to conclude a Subsidiary Alliance ; the second was completely crushed while the power of the third was shattered. He thus realised his ambition of making the British the predominant power in India.

The Nizam:—The Nizam, whose power was greatly weakened by his recent defeat at Kharda at the hands of the Marathas, was induced to enter into a Subsidiary Alliance with the Company in 1798. He agreed to dismiss the French officers in his employ, to disarm and disband the force trained by French officers and to support a contingent of Company's troops. Thus was the Nizam reduced to complete dependence on the English. The French influence disappeared from his court.

The Nizam enters into Subsidiary Alliance.

The Fourth Mysore War, 1799:—Having disarmed the Nizam, Wellesley turned to the ruler of Mysore. Ever since the treaty of Seringapatam (1792) Tipu had been maturing hostile designs against the English. He had sent ambassadors to the French at Mauritius whose Governor welcomed his proposal of an offensive alliance. A few French volunteers also joined Tipu's service. Wellesley demanded of Tipu an explanation of his dealings with the French and considering Tipu's replies as evasive and unsatisfactory, determined on war and set his forces in motion. Two armies were despatched against Mysore ; one, the main army, by way of the Carnatic under General Harris and the other from Bombay. The Nizam also sent a contingent under the Governor-General's brother, Arthur Wellesley, afterwards the famous Duke of Wellington. Tipu was first defeated by the Bombay army and then completely routed at *Malavelli* by Harris. He retired to his capital Seringapatam which was stormed and he fell fighting gallantly. His death removed a formidable enemy of the English and deprived the French of their best ally in India—the twofold results of the last Mysore War.

Tipu tried to form an alliance with the French.

Defeat and death of Tipu.

Results.

Wellesley's
Mysore
policy.

Wellesley's object had been to cripple Tipu permanently rather than to destroy his power utterly. Now that Tipu was dead he did not think it expedient to allow any member of Haidar Ali's family to rule Mysore, for such a member was not likely to be well disposed to the English. So he annexed a large portion of the Mysore territory and gave a fragment to the Nizam. The State thus reduced was handed over to a child of the Hindu royal family which had been dispossessed by Haidar Ali. The administration of the territory, thus given to the child Raja, was entrusted to a capable Brahman minister named Purnia who acted under British supervision and was bound by the usual terms of the Subsidiary Alliance. The sons of Tipu were provided for by generous pension. The territories annexed by the English included Canara, Coimbatore and the sea-coast districts. The lands on the north-west assigned to the Nizam were shortly after surrendered by him in lieu of the payment for the subsidiary force.

Partition of
Mysore
between the
Company
and the
Nizam and
the residue
restored to
the old
Hindu royal
family.

N.B.—The Marathas were offered a share in the Mysore territories on certain conditions but they rejected the terms.

Wellesley's policy of annexation

Forward
policy.

Lord Wellesley was imperialistic to the backbone and he adopted what is called a "forward policy" in extending British authority over some of the Indian states. He held that the "Company with relation to its territory in India must be viewed in the capacity of a sovereign power" and applied this principle first to small decadent states and then in more important fields. He took advantage of a disputed succession in the Maratha principality of Tanjore to absorb that district. In 1799 the Raja of Tanjore was persuaded to conclude a subsidiary treaty by which he surrendered the whole administration in return for a yearly pension. A change of succession at Surat gave Wellesley a similar opportunity. On the death of the Nawab of Surat he brushed aside in a high-handed

Annexation
of Surat
and Tanjore.

manner the legitimate claims of the brother of the Nawab and pensioned him off (1800).

Wellesley next turned to the Carnatic whose government had long been an open scandal. The double government of the Carnatic was more disastrous and oppressive than the double government of Bengal. Hence Wellesley made up his mind to take over the administration of the territory. He soon found a plausible pretext. The papers found at Seringapatam after Tipu's death showed that both Muhammad Ali who died in 1795 and his son Umdat-ul-Umra carried on some sort of correspondence with Tipu. Wellesley chose to interpret this correspondence as treasonable and on the death of Umdat-ul-Umra in 1801 took over the whole civil and military government of the Carnatic, ignoring the claims of the son of the deceased Nawab. He set up a new Nawab and guaranteed him a pension of one-fifth of the revenue. It should be noted that the papers in question were not at all convincing proofs of the treachery of the Nawabs. Wellesley annexed the Carnatic purely from an imperialistic motive, though the undeniable evils of the Nawab's government to which the Company's servants contributed a good deal, gave him some justification.

Annexation
of the
Carnatic
(1801).

Wellesley's Oudh policy:—Wellesley's attention was called to Oudh by the necessity of strengthening the Company's north-western frontier. Warren Hastings had made Oudh a buffer-state, but owing to prevailing misgovernment that province had become weak and a source of danger to the British position in India. A strong enemy could easily occupy Oudh and threaten Bengal. Hence Wellesley was anxious to tighten British hold on Oudh. This he proceeded to do in a most high-handed manner. Finding a pretext in the threat of Zaman Shah, a grandson of Ahmad Shah Abdali, to invade Hindusthan, Wellesley forced upon the Nawab of Oudh a new treaty in 1801. By it the Nawab was to cede Gorakhpur, Rohil-

Wellesley's
conduct was
high-
handed.

khand and the Lower Doab comprising the territories between the Ganges and the Jumna in order to provide permanently for the cost of maintaining the Company's troops stationed in Oudh. The Nawab appealed to old treaties and protested against this act of spoliation but in vain. The Oudh policy of Wellesley was purely arbitrary and was carried out in ruthless disregard of the feelings and interests of the Nawab who was the Company's ally and had done nothing to merit such rough treatment. It is true that Oudh was weak through misgovernment but it is also true that much of this misgovernment was due to the rapacity of the "English locusts" as Wellesley himself called the English parasites who infested the capital and filled their pockets. Wellesley's policy did not improve the administration of the kingdom. On the contrary the new Subsidiary Alliance which he imposed on Oudh aggravated the evils of administration, which in the long run gave Lord Dalhousie a good pretext to annex the kingdom. Wellesley's high-handed conduct has been condemned by Mill and other British writers. His only justification was the comfortable plea of political necessity. He found Oudh a source of danger to the British position : "he left it a safeguard and support."

Indian
troops sent
to Egypt.

Embassy to
Persia.

Steps against French peril:—Wellesley projected an expedition against Mauritius but the English admiral refused to co-operate with him without authorisation from Home. He urged the Ministry to capture Ceylon and Batavia from the Dutch now in alliance with France, but failed to secure the consent of the ministers. He sent Indian troops to Egypt to co-operate in the expulsion of the French from that country but no fighting took place on account of the previous defeat of the French. He sent an embassy to Persia under John Malcolm to counteract French and Russian advance in that direction. The embassy secured considerable political and commercial advantages.

The Maratha affairs:—When Wellesley assumed the charge of the Government, the internal politics of the Marathas presented a scene of terrible confusion. The death of Ahalya Bai, the saintly lady who had guided the affairs of Holkar's dominions with wisdom and justice for thirty years, was followed by a scramble for power in which Jaswant Rao Holkar came out victorious. Mahadaji Sindhia had been succeeded by Daulat Rao. There existed a bitter feud between Jaswant Rao and Daulat Rao and each plundered the other's territory. The affairs of the Peshwa Baji Rao II were under the able guidance of the great Maratha statesman, Nana Fadnavis, but the treacherous Peshwa was always intriguing to bring about the ruin of the great minister. The other Maratha powers were the Bhonsla Raja of Berar who was rather isolated by position from the Poona intrigues, and the Gaikwar of Baroda, who was friendly to the English. Thus there was no unity among the Maratha chiefs. Their titular head was the Peshwa but all real power had passed out of his hands. Each of the chiefs were bent upon self-aggrandisement, quite heedless of the general welfare of the Maratha confederacy.

The chief Maratha powers and their rivalries.

Wellesley's Maratha policy:—Cornwallis and Shore had pursued a policy of strict non-interference towards the Maratha chiefs, but to Wellesley such a policy was impossible owing to the changed political conditions brought about by the destruction of Tipu and the subjection of the Nizam to the British control. The chiefs had claims outstanding against both Mysore and the Nizam for the realisation of the *chauth* and other accounts, and so they regarded with great uneasiness the Nizam's Subsidiary Alliance with the English and the practical incorporation of Mysore in the Company's dominions. Besides, the British protection now ensured to the Nizam, deprived the Marathas of one of their most fertile plundering preserves. Hence friction between the English and the Mara-

Change in the political relations with the Marathas.

thus was only a question of time. Wellesley's policy was to keep the Marathas quiet by inducing the Peshwa, whom he professed to treat as the actual head of the Marathas, to enter into a treaty of Subsidiary Alliance with the Company. He pursued his object with great tenacity but failed as long as Nana Fadnavis lived.

Causes of the war.

Baji Rao being defeated by Holkar seeks English protection and concludes the Treaty of Bassien (1802).

Second Maratha War:—In 1800, the able statesman Nana Fadnavis died and with him departed “all the wisdom and moderation of the Maratha Government.” There was no one else capable enough to mediate between the Maratha chiefs and to moderate their rivalries. Both Daulat Rao Sindhia and Jaswant Rao Holkar at once endeavoured to attain the upper hand at Poona and went to war with each other. The Peshwa Baji Rao II favoured Sindhia but Jaswant Rao inflicted a signal defeat on the united forces of the Peshwa and Sindhia at the battle of Poona in 1802. Baji Rao fled, whereupon Holkar set up Amrit Rao, brother by adoption of Baji Rao, as Peshwa. Baji Rao fled for refuge to Bassien and appealed to the English for help. By the **Treaty of Bassien** he entered into a Subsidiary Alliance with the English and agreed to maintain a subsidiary force, to exclude all Europeans of nations hostile to the British, to abstain from hostilities or negotiations with other states without the consent of the British Government, and to accept British arbitration in disputes with the Nizam and the Guikwar. Baji Rao was restored to the Peshwaship with the help of a British force (1802). Thus, the Peshwa sacrificed his independence as the price of British protection.

***Importance of the Treaty of Bassien.**

The treaty of Bassien is one of the most important land marks of British dominion in India, it brought the head of the Maratha confederacy under British control. “Henceforward the Company had either to control the greatest Indian power (the Marathas) or was committed to hostilities with it.” The subordination of the head of

the Marathas to British control, meant by implication the subordination of the members of the Maratha confederacy. The Maratha chiefs had either to acquiesce or to offer armed opposition.

Sindhia and the Bhonsla Raja of Berar were furious when they heard of the Treaty of Bassien. Though they were often at variance with the Peshwa, their nominal head, they did not like that any foreign power should lower his prestige. Hence they regarded the treaty as an open surrender of national independence. They composed their differences and joined their forces. The Peshwa secretly approved of their action. Guessing their hostile intention the British Government requested Sindhia and the Raja of Berar to withdraw their troops from the Nizam's frontier. They refused and so the war began in 1803. Holkar for a time held aloof.

Sindhia and the Raja of Berar refused to recognise the Treaty of Bassien and hence the war began.

The chief theatres of the war were the Deccan, Hindusthan and Orissa. The Deccan campaign was entrusted to Sir Arthur Wellesley who captured Ahmadnagar and defeated the combined armies of Sindhia and the Bhonsla at **Assaye** in 1803. Sindhia was then offered a truce but the Bhonsla was pursued and again defeated at *Argaon*. This was followed by the capture of the fortress of Gawligarh. The Bhonsla then came to terms by the *Treaty of Deogaon* by which he ceded Cuttack to the English and accepted a Subsidiary Alliance.

The Treaty of Deogaon closed the war with the Bhonsla, Raja of Berar.

The campaign in Hindusthan was entrusted to General Lake who captured Aligarh, defeated Sindhia's troops near Delhi and took the aged Emperor Shah Alam under British protection. The remaining troops of Sindhia were next defeated at *Laswari* after which the war was ended by the *Treaty of Surji-Arjangaon*. By it Sindhia accepted a Subsidiary Alliance and surrendered Broach, Ahmadnagar and the territory between the Ganges and the Jumna, including Agra and Delhi. Thus as the result of this war Company's dominions

Treaty of Surji-Arjangaon with Sindhia.

Results. were widely extended. The annexation of the Doab carried the English frontier to the upper course of the Jumna while the acquisition of Cuttack linked up the provinces of Bengal and Madras.

War with Holkar:—Holkar, who had so long watched the course of affairs, now determined to fight on his own account. He raided the territories of the Rajput allies of the British and demanded from the English *chauth* and cession of territories. Wellesley rejected these demands and declared war. Holkar's first attempts were successful. He forced Colonel Monson to retreat and inflicted upon him an overwhelming defeat in the Mukund Dara Pass in Rajputana. The Raja of Bharatpur now renounced his alliance with the British and joined Holkar in an attack on Delhi. The attempt, however, failed. Next Holkar was defeated at *Deeg* but the victory was not decisive. Lord Lake now laid siege to Bharatpur and launched four successive attacks all of which, however, were repulsed. This was a serious blow to the British prestige. Lake made a peace with the Raja of Bharatpur, who, in his turn, returned to his alliance with the English and promised to pay an indemnity of 20 lakhs of rupees.

Recall of Wellesley:—The aggressive policy of Wellesley was not liked by the Home authorities and even in the hour of victory the Ministry had faltered in their usual approval of his actions. But when the news of Monson's disaster reached England the Ministry recalled him, characterising his action as illegal and imprudent. The opposition to Wellesley's policy was not confined to official circles. The Courts of Proprietors and Directors also clamoured for his recall, for his wars and annexations were expensive and threatened the dividend of the shareholders. They also disliked his policy of free trade which sought to deprive the Company of its monopoly of Eastern trade.

Reasons for his recall.

***Achievements of Wellesley:**—The achievements of Wellesley entitle him to a front rank among the Governors-General of India. He destroyed the power of Tipu, excluded French influence from India, extended British control, protective but dictatorial, over the Nizam and the ruler of Oudh, made the Peshwa dependent on British support, broke the power of Sindhia and the Raja of Berar and brought the Carnatic, Tanjore and Surat under the direct rule of the Company. In a word, he made the British Government paramount power in India. The remark often made that during his period of office the British empire in India became the British Empire of India is undoubtedly true. He was an imperialistic statesman with large and comprehensive views. He was convinced that every annexation was a clear benefit to the people of the annexed territory, for it freed them from the misrule of the local rulers. Hence he made annexations right and left without any qualms of conscience. He tried to secure better training and education for the civil servants of the Company by establishing a college in Calcutta, but the Directors did not sanction his plan and turned his college into a school for teaching Oriental languages. He encouraged private trade for which he incurred the displeasure of the Directors. His temper was imperious ; he was impatient of opposition, regardless of the feelings of Indian rulers and somewhat unscrupulous in the diplomatic pressure he exerted against those who resisted his designs. His treatment of the ruler of Oudh and some of his annexations were, beyond doubt, high-handed proceedings.

He made the Company paramount power in India.

His attempt to reform Civil Service.

His character.

Nana Fadnavis:—Nana Fadnavis was the foremost Maratha politician during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. He came into prominence during the period of troubles that followed the murder of Peshwa Narayan Rao (1772). The instigator of this murder was Raghaba who usurp-

The part he
played
during the
First
Maratha
War.

ed the Peshwaship. Nana Fadnavis took up the cause of the infant son of the murdered Peshwa. Thereupon Raghaba sought British aid and this led to the outbreak of the first Anglo-Maratha conflict. It was Nana's firmness that foiled the designs of both Raghaba and his British supporters. In the Treaty of Salbai (1782) the English had to abandon the cause of Raghaba and recognise Madhab Rao II, the infant son of Narayan Rao, as the Peshwa. This treaty was a great triumph for Nana Fadnavis. It saved the Maratha empire from the insidious clutches of the English and preserved its integrity.

His
diplomacy.

Nana Fadnavis then turned his attention to the consolidation of the position of the Marathas. In this he showed great diplomatic ability for which his European contemporaries described him as the Maratha Machiavelli. Tipu Sultan of Mysore was the common enemy of both the Nizam and the Marathas. Hence he co-operated with the Nizam in his attempt to humble Tipu and to recover from him lost territories. In 1785 when Tipu made a gratuitous attack upon the Maratha territory, Nana formed an alliance with the Nizam and forced Tipu to surrender the districts of Badami, Kittur and Nargund and to pay a large sum of money (1787). In the Third Anglo-Mysore War he joined the English along with the Nizam against Tipu and by the Treaty of Seringapatan (1792) obtained territories which extended the Maratha empire up to the Tungabhadra (see p. 59). In 1795 he organised a coalition of the leading Maratha chiefs against the Nizam who was defeated at the battle of Kharda. Thus he managed to hold together the leading Maratha chiefs and did much to keep both the Nizam and Tipu Sultan in fear of the Maratha power. He wielded unbounded authority at Poona and the Peshwa, Madhab Rao II, growing weary of his galling tutelage, committed suicide in 1796. Despite the

His wars
against
Tipu Sultan.

Defeat of
the Nizam
at Kharda
—1795.

extraordinary difficulties which beset him on all sides Nana steadily refused to be drawn into the meshes of Wellesley's Subsidiary Alliance. As long as he lived he baffled all Wellesley's attempts. He died in 1800 and "with him departed all the wisdom and moderation of the Maratha government." (Great Duff describes him as a "great statesman" and in private life "a man of strict veracity, humane, frugal and charitable." There is no doubt that he did his best for his master and country under difficult and trying circumstances.

Grant Duff's estimate.

Lord Cornwallis again:—On Wellesley's recall Lord Cornwallis, though now a very old man, was appointed as his successor. He came to India, determined to reverse the policy of Wellesley and to revert to the idea of non-intervention and balance of power. He hastened to end the hostilities with Holkar and to pacify Sindhia. He decided to restore Gwalior and Gohud to Sindhia, to relinquish all territory west of the Jumna and to withdraw British protection from several Rajput States, leaving them to the tender mercies of Sindhia. So eager was he to conciliate Sindhia that he did not insist on the release of the British Resident whom the latter had kept in confinement. Cornwallis, however, could not carry out his policy as he died after a few months of his arrival (1805).

His second Government.

Sir George Barlow (1805—1807):—On the death of Cornwallis, Sir George Barlow succeeded him as temporary Governor-General. In pursuance of the orders of the Home authorities Barlow strictly followed the policy of non-intervention specially with regard to the Marathas in Upper India. He gave back Gwalior and Gohud to Sindhia, withdrew British protection from the Rajputs and agreed to the river Chambal being the boundary between Sindhia's dominions and Company's territory. He also gave advantageous terms to Holkar although the latter was reduced to great extremity by the successful operations of

His policy of non-intervention.

Treaties with Sindhia and Holkar.

Results.

Lord Lake. Holkar was also given a free hand against the Rajput States. The withdrawal of British protection from the Rajput chiefs to some of whom the English were under special obligations (*e.g.*, the Raja of Jaipur and the Raja of Bundi) greatly compromised British honour and reputation.

The Nizam checked and the Treaty of Bassein maintained.

In two instances Barlow was forced to modify his policy of non-intervention. He forced the Nizam to abide by the terms of the Subsidiary Alliance which he was intriguing to subvert. He also resisted the orders of the Directors who instructed him to withdraw from the Treaty of Bassein and to allow the Peshwa to resume his old position as the head of the Maratha States. His internal administration was sound, and by strict economy he converted the financial deficit into a surplus.

Mutiny of Vellore.

The only other important event of Barlow's administration was the *Mutiny of the Sepoys at Vellore*. Some injudicious regulations requiring the Sepoys to wear a novel pattern of turban, to train their beard in a particular way and to abstain from putting sectarian marks on their forehead, were taken to imply an attack on their caste and religion. It was suspected that the sons of Tipu, who were stationed at Vellore, fomented the discontent of Sepoys. The Sepoys rose in mutiny and massacred 113 European soldiers including 14 officers. The disturbances were suppressed and Lord William Bentinck, Governor of Madras, who was responsible for the regulations, was recalled.

LORD MINTO (1807—1813)

His policy.

Lord Minto superseded Sir George Barlow as the Governor-General of India. He had been the President of the Board of Control and he came to India, pledged to the policy of non-intervention. But he soon found reasons to revise his views and

was obliged from time to time to abandon the attitude of strict neutrality. Soon after his arrival in 1808, a rebellion broke out in Travancore and the Raja's minister, Velu Tampi, murdered some European soldiers and attacked the Resident. The rising, however, was soon put down. This was followed by the mutiny of officers of the Madras army, caused by the attempt of Sir George Barlow who had been appointed Governor of Madras, to check some unofficial perquisites enjoyed by the officers. The mutiny was, however, suppressed.

Within the limits of India, Minto on the whole followed the policy of non-intervention in pursuance of the strict instructions of the Home authorities. But on three occasions he was compelled to depart from that policy, *viz.*, in Bundelkhand, in regard to the Raja of Berar, and the Sikhs. Bundelkhand had been ceded to the Company by the Marathas but the province soon became a prey to terrible anarchy owing to the turbulence of the local chiefs. To maintain the prestige of the British Government, Minto was forced to intervene. The turbulent chiefs were defeated and their strongholds captured including the fortresses of Ajaigarh and Kalanjar. Minto also helped the Raja of Berar to repulse the invasion of Amir Khan, the Pathan leader of a band of freebooters. But he could not crush Amir Khan for fear of being involved in a general Maratha war. The same cause prevented him from stopping the Pindari outrages.

His departure from the policy of non-intervention.

Disturbances in Bundelkhand put down.

***Relation with the Sikhs:—**During Minto's Progress of administration the British Government for the first time came in touch with the Sikhs. It has already been noticed how the Sikhs, originally a religious sect, had been hammered into a military power by their conflicts with the Afghans. After the withdrawal of Ahmad Shah Durrani in 1767, they occupied the country between Rawalpindi and the Jumna. Their further progress was checked by the Marathas, but when the Maratha

power in Hindusthan was broken by Lord Lake in 1803, the Sikhs were filled with fresh hope.

Rise of
Ranjit Singh.

About this time there rose to power the great leader of the Sikhs, named **Ranjit Singh**. When only 19 years old he had helped Zaman Shah, the Afghan ruler of Kabul, in invading the Punjab and was appointed by him governor of Lahore with the title of Raja (1799). Three years later, in 1802, he made himself master of Amritsar, the holy city of the Sikhs, and gradually brought all the Sikh *misl*s or fraternities west of the Sutlej under his control. By degrees he increased his power till he made himself master of the Punjab and Kashmir. He had a fine army trained by the French officers. Encouraged by Sir George Barlow's policy of non-intervention Ranjit Singh sought to extend his authority over the territory of the Sikh chieftains, who dwelt east of the Sutlej in the country lying between that river and the Jumna, sometimes known as Sirhind. This province formerly owed the supremacy of Sindhia but after the expulsion of the latter from Hindusthan, had been informally taken under British protection.

Minto checked the attempt of Ranjit Singh to extend his influence beyond the Sutlej.

Treaty of Amritsar with Ranjit Singh.

In 1806, some of the Sikh chiefs of Sirhind quarrelled among themselves and sought Ranjit Singh's intervention. Ranjit, eager to extend his influence, crossed the Sutlej and occupied Ludhiana. At this the Sikh chiefs took alarm and appealed to the English for protection. Lord Minto was determined to confine Ranjit Singh to the line west of the Sutlej and sent Charles Metcalfe as his envoy to his Sikh court. After much negotiation a treaty was signed at Amritsar in 1809, which fixed the river Sutlej as the boundary of Rajit Singh's authority, and established "perpetual amity" between the contracting parties. Henceforth the British frontier advanced from the Jumna to the Sutlej. This arrangement was honourably kept during the remaining thirty years of Ranjit Singh's life.

Foreign embassies:—Lord Minto took steps

to counteract the intrigues of Napoleon, who, now in alliance with Russia by the treaty of Tilsit, was seeking to stir up the Asiatic nations within his reach against England. So, in 1808 he sent a mission to Persia under John Malcolm. A Royal embassy was also sent independently by the Home Government. An unseemly quarrel arose between the rival British missions. Ultimately Minto found himself obliged to accept the treaty concluded by the Crown envoy with the Shah of Persia. By it, the Shah agreed to resist the passage through his dominions of a European force marching on India, in return for a promise of assistance in men or money if his country were attacked by Europeans. A mission, sent to Kabul under Mountstuart Elphinstone on a similar errand, led to no direct political results on account of the expulsion of Shah Suja, the Afghan ruler, to whom it had been despatched. A third mission was sent to the Amirs of Sind who promised to exclude the French from their territory.

Missions to Persia, Afghanistan and Sind to counteract French menace.

Naval Expeditions:—Besides diplomatic missions, Lord Minto undertook offensive warfare against the French. He sent a naval expedition against the two French colonies of Bourbon and Mauritius from which the French privateers used to prey upon the British shipping. The islands were captured. Another expedition was sent against Java which was captured from the Dutch then in alliance with the French (1810). These conquests, with the exception of Mauritius were restored at the general peace in 1815. Thus Minto's foreign policy was crowned with brilliant success. The French colonies in the East were captured and England was left without a rival in the Eastern hemisphere.

Capture of Mauritius, Bourbon and Java.

Renewal of the Charter, 1813:—The Charter, granted to the Company in 1793, by which it had been allowed the monopoly of Eastern trade for twenty years, expired in 1813. When the question of the renewal of the Charter came for con-

Abolition of
the Com-
pany's mono-
poly of
Indian trade.

sideration, the British public insisted that the trade should be thrown open to all, while the Directors fought hard to retain their monopoly. In the end a compromise was arrived at. Parliament allowed the Company to retain its monopoly of the China trade but the Indian trade was thrown open to all Englishmen. The Charter allowed the Company to continue to hold and administer its territorial acquisitions "*without prejudice to the undoubted sovereignty of the British Crown* in and over the same." Thus the sovereignty of the Crown, hitherto recognised only in the island of Bombay, was declared by Parliament to cover all the Company's possessions in India. This is the beginning of the process which eventually led to the transfer of the government of India from the Company to the Crown. Another important feature of the Charter was that it for the first time allotted a sum of a lakh of rupees for the encouragement of education among Indians. This shows that the British nation was awakening to a sense of responsibility for the intellectual improvement of the people committed to their charge. Spiritual needs of the Europeans were provided for by the appointment of a bishop in Calcutta and three archdeacons. Improved arrangements for the training of the civil and military servants of the Company were sanctioned. Subject to these provisions the Charter of the Company was renewed for twenty years.

Importance
of the
Charter Act
of 1813.

MARQUESS OF HASTINGS (1813—1823)

His policy.

Lord Moira, better known by his later title of Marquess of Hastings, was nominated as the successor of Lord Minto. He had been an opponent of Lord Wellesley's policy of aggrandisement and he came to India with a fixed determination to pursue the policy of non-intervention. But the peculiar condition of India forced him to revise his views and he found himself constrained to act on the lines of Wellesley and to complete his work.

Non-intervention abandoned:—The policy of non-intervention as pursued by Lord Cornwallis and Sir George Barlow and which Lord Minto also was forced to adopt in deference to the strict instructions of the Home Government, had given rise to grave internal disorders and encouraged aggression on the British territory. The policy was looked upon as a sign of weakness and the Gurkhas and the Burmese assumed an aggressive attitude. But what discredited the policy of non-intervention most was the ravages of the Pindaris whose devastations inflicted untold misery on the people of Central India. The accumulation of these disorders decided Lord Hastings to give up the policy of non-intervention. When he took over charge he found "seven different quarrels likely to demand the decision of arms." The most pressing of these quarrels was that with the Gurkhas of Nepal.

War with Nepal (1814—16):—The Gurkhas, a hardy race of warlike stock, had overthrown the ancient ruling dynasties of the Nepal valley in 1768 and gradually extended their power over the whole hilly region from the frontier of Bhutan on the east to the Sutlej on the west. They sought to extend their dominion over the plains below and as the boundary between the Gurkha and the British territories was ill-defined, constant frictions arose. Encouraged by the non-intervention policy of the English, the Gurkhas displayed an aggressive attitude and occupied a number of villages on the British side of the frontier. Their aggression reached a head when they occupied the districts of Butwal and Sheoraj. On their refusal to restore the districts Lord Hastings declared war in 1814.

The Nepal War was well-planned but ill-executed. Lord Hastings planned a simultaneous attack on the enemy at four distinct points, but owing to the incapacity of the Generals and the bravery of the Gurkhas, the opening campaign

Reasons which led to the abandonment of this policy.

Encroachment of the Gurkhas on British territory led to this war.

Early defeats of the English.

Treaty of
Sagauli
closed the
Nepal war.

proved disastrous. The Gurkhas, though far outnumbered, put up a gallant fight. They defeated and killed General Gillespie, the hero of the fighting in Java, and repulsed three other Generals. But the English occupied Almora, and General Ochterlony operating from Ludhiana compelled the Gurkha leader, Amar Singh, to surrender the fort of Malaon. A treaty was then made but the Nepalese Durbar refused to ratify it. Hostilities were resumed and Ochterlony threatened the Nepalese capital. At this the Gurkhas came to terms and signed the **Treaty of Sagauli** in 1816. By it, they agreed to withdraw from Sikkim, to surrender most of the Terai or lowlands, to cede the provinces of Garhwal and Kumaon to the west of the Kali river and to accept a Resident in their capital, Kathamandu. The territories ceded to the English are of temperate climate and have favoured the growth of hill-stations such as Simla, Almora, Naini Tal, etc.

The Pindaris
were not a
nation but
a body of
plunderers.

They ravaged
Central
India.

The Pindari War:—The Pindaris were bands of lawless men who made their living by organised plunder. They did not belong to any particular nationality but were drawn from all castes and classes. The only bond which bound them together was their common profession of robbery. They were loosely attached as irregulars to the armies of either Sindhia or Holkar, and have been well described as the “scavengers of the Marathas.” Starting from a central position in Malawa and the Narbada valley they ravaged India with fiendish cruelty from Gujarat to Ganjam. About this time the three chief leaders of the Pindaris were Chitu, Wasil Muhammad and Karim Khan. Besides the Pindaris, there were roving bands of Pathans who, under their leader, Amir Khan, plundered right and left wherever they could find an opening.

Encouraged by the non-intervention policy of the British government the Pindaris extended their raids far and wide in Central India, and grew more and more daring. In 1815, they plundered the

Nizam's dominions and next year ravaged the British territory of the Northern Circars. Lord Hastings found it imperatively necessary to take vigorous measures to put a stop to this depredations and began military preparations on an extensive scale. First, by diplomacy he detached the Pindaris as far as possible from the protection of the Marathas. He concluded a subsidiary alliance with Apa Sahib, the Regent of the Bhonsla's territory of Berar, and put pressure upon Sindhia who was compelled, much against his inclination, to sign a treaty binding him to assist the English against the Pindaris. Next he set his vast forces in motion to surround the Pindaris in their haunts in Malwa. The Pindaris were dispersed and their organised bands annihilated. Karim Khan surrendered, Wasil committed suicide while Chitu, the most formidable of the leaders, was hunted into the jungle where he was devoured by a tiger. Amu Khan, the Pathan chieft, was persuaded to disband his forces and was made Nawab of Tonk.

The ravage of the Northern Circars led to the war against the Pindaris

The Pindaris were hunted out and dispersed.

Third Maratha War:—Ever since the treaty of Bassein, Bajirao II had been intriguing to free himself from British control. In 1815, his minister Timbajji murdered the Gorkhans' Brahman envoy, who visited Poona under a British safe conduct. Bajirao's complicity in the guilt was strongly suspected and the British Resident (Elphinstone) forced him to surrender Timbajji and to sign a new subsidiary treaty involving cession of territory and an explicit renunciation of his claim to the headship of the Maratha Confederacy (1817). This was too much for Bajirao. He rose in rebellion and attacked and burnt the British Residency. He was, however, defeated at *Ashti* and compelled to flee southwards. Meanwhile Apa Sahib Bhonsla of Nagpur and Holkar (or rather his government for he was still a minor) declared war against the English. Apa Sahib was defeated at *Sitabaldi* and forced to surrender. His troops, however, fought another

Bajirao's intrigues against the English

Bajirao defeated at Kirki, Apa Sahib at Sitabaldi and Holkar at Mahadpur.

battle near Nagpur but were completely routed. Holkar's forces were crushed at *Mahidpur*. The final operations of the war were directed against the fugitive Peshwa whose brave general Bapu Gokla gave battle to the English at *Ashti* but was defeated and killed. The Peshwa suffered another defeat at *Koregaon* and in 1819 the fortress of Asurgarh fell. Baji Rao then surrendered to the English and the third and last Maratha War came to a close.

*The Marathas were *finally* crushed.

Results:—Baji Rao's dominions were annexed and he was granted a pension of 8 lakhs of rupees a year. The office of the Peshwa was abolished and a representative of the line of Sivaji was placed on the throne of Satara with a small principality carved out of Baji Rao's forfeited dominions. Asaf Shihab of Nagpur was deposed and a new Raja was set up on the throne. The Narbada territories of the Bhonsla were annexed. Holkar entered into a subsidiary treaty involving the cession of territory and renunciation of all claims on the Rajputs. Thus the power of the leading Maratha chiefs was crushed for ever and the English became paramount in India.

Extension of British supremacy over the Rajput States.

British supremacy in Rajputana:—It was during the administration of Lord Hastings that the British influence was established over Rajputana and Central India. In the eighteenth century the Rajput states had become a spent force. They had been weakened by internal factions and dynastic quarrels and so were exposed to the terrible depredations of the Marathas, the Pathans and the Pindaris. In particular, Sindhia dominated them. They had sought British protection but failed to secure it because of the policy of non-intervention pursued by Barlow and Lord Minto. Lord Hastings, on the other hand, realised the importance of an alliance with the Rajput States. It would give the Company immense strategic advantages and place at its disposal the resources of Raj-

putana for defensive and offensive purposes. Besides, the help of the Rajputs would be of great value in rounding up the Pindaris whom Hastings was determined to crush. Hence he forced Sindhia to renounce his claims upon the Rajput Princes and thus got a free hand to deal with them. The Rajput Princes welcomed the sheltering arm of British protection and concluded subsidiary treaties by which they acknowledged British paramountcy in return for protection against external enemies. Metcalfe concluded treaties with nineteen Rajput States, including Jaipur, Udaipur, Jodhpur and Bundi.

As the result of the suppression of the Pindaris British authority was extended to Central India. The Nawab of Bhopal entered into a treaty of "defensive and subordinate alliance" with the Company. The minor states of Malwa and Bundelkhand also concluded similar treaties and acknowledged British paramountcy.

British
supremacy
in Central
India.

N.B.—Note the changed character of the treaties which Lord Hastings concluded with the States of Rajputana and Central India. The treaties concluded by Wellesley were negotiated on terms of equality and were based on the principle of "reciprocity and amity." But Lord Hastings substituted for it the principle of "subordinate co-operation" and thereby established British paramountcy over most of the Indian states. This principle was followed up to 1857.

Lord
Hastings'
policy of
subordinate
co-operation.

Suppression of revolts:—Hastings suppressed the disturbances in Orissa where the people were driven to revolt by over-assessment, undue enhancement of the salt tax and general misgovernment. The revolt was put down and the grievances of the people were redressed. An outbreak of the Mussalmans at Bareilly, caused by the imposition of a municipal tax and other grievances, was put down. The zemindar of Hathras who had shown an insubordinate spirit refused to dismantle his fort. Hastings made suitable mili-

Revolts in
Orissa and
Bareilly put
down.

tary preparation and bombarded the fort with success.

Judicial
reforms.

Internal reforms:—Lord Hastings' internal administration was marked by notable progress. He increased the number of courts in Bengal and, to some extent, enhanced the power of the Indian officials. The procedure in civil cases was simplified and the administration of criminal justice reorganised. The separation of the judicial from the executive power as effected by Lord Cornwallis was abolished. Lord Hastings encouraged education by establishing vernacular schools, abolished the censorship of the press and paid attention to public works such as the construction of roads and bridges. Measures were taken to protect the rights of the ryots as against the zemindars, the ryots being given a certain prescriptive right of occupancy as long as they paid their customary rents. In Madras, the 'ryotwary' settlement was carried through by Sir Thomas Munro and a general improvement was effected in the finances of the empire.

Education
encouraged.

Ryotwary
Settlement.

His resignation:—Lord Hastings was censured by the Home authorities on account of the indiscreet indulgence he had shown to the banking house of Palmer and Co. which with his sanction, had made large advances to the Nizam. One of the partners of the firm was married to a ward of his, and so the Governor-General in supporting the corrupt financial dealings of the firm laid himself open to suspicion. Lord Hastings was so distressed by the strictures passed upon him that he resigned in 1823.

The affairs
of Palmer
and Co.

His achievements:—Lord Hastings completed the work begun by Wellesley and made the British power paramount in India. His work amounted to a revolution in the political states of India. The Peshwa was dethroned and his hereditary office abolished. Holkar was shorn of half of his territory. The Bhonsla Raja of Nagpur was reduced to the condition of a vassal. Sindhia was

humbled and rendered powerless for harm. Besides, by suppressing the Pindaris he provided for the security of life and property in Central India. The Rajputs were relieved from the spoliation to which they were subjected by the Marathas and they gladly submitted to the suzerainty of the Company. In a word, his military operations, besides extending the British dominions, secured peace and prosperity to the people in those troubled times. His internal administration was enlightened. He encouraged education and removed the censorship of the press. Outside India his great achievement was the conquest of Singapore.

Conquest of
Singapore.

Review : Relation of the Company with the Marathas till 1818

Warren Hastings tried to avoid entanglements with the Marathas but at the same time took steps to check their possible raids in Bengal. It was the fear of Maratha invasion that prompted him to strengthen the position of Oudh. The Emperor Shah Alam had then left British protection and placed himself under the power of Sindhia who was using the prestige of the Emperor's name to aggrandise himself. Hence Hastings strengthened the position of the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh by selling to him Kora and Allahabad and by helping him to annex Rohilkhand. He thus created a strong buffer state against the Marathas. In the Deccan the Bombay government tried to play at king-making by espousing the cause of Raghuba against the legitimate Peshwa (*cf.* the conduct of Clive) and thus brought on a Maratha war much against Hastings' will. Hastings showed great resourcefulness and energy, and, by winning over Sindhia, brought the war to a close by the Treaty of Salbai (1782).

Warren
Hastings'
Maratha
policy.

Lord Cornwallis kept on good terms with the Marathas and sought their alliance against Tipu. But he peremptorily told Sindhia to keep his hands

Cornwallis sought the alliance of the Marathas against Tipu.

Policy of Sir John Shore.

Wellesley's Maratha policy.

Sir George Barlow's policy.

Final destruction of the Maratha power by Lord Hastings.

off Oudh. His successor, Sir John Shore, strictly followed the policy of non-intervention and allowed the Marathas a free hand against the Nizam. The result was that the Nizam suffered an overwhelming defeat at Kharda in 1795. The power of the Marathas increased but their further aggrandisement was prevented by the discord and disorder that followed the suicide of the Peshwa Madhu Rao Narayan. The death of Nana Fadnavis, the able minister of the Peshwa, aggravated the situation and a civil war broke out among the Maratha leaders. This gave Lord Wellesley the much-desired opportunity to interfere in the Maratha affairs. The Peshwa Baji Rao II being defeated by Holkar, entered into a subsidiary alliance with the English by the Treaty of Bassien. The subjection of the technical head of the Marathas to the British control was looked upon as a national humiliation and Sindhia and the Bhonsla Raja of Nagpur, took arms against the English. They were, however, defeated and compelled to accept treaties of subsidiary alliance. Holkar next declared war but was humbled though not crushed. Thus, under Wellesley the power of the Marathas was shattered.

Sir George Barlow followed the policy of non-intervention and gave advantageous terms of peace both to Sindhia and Holkar. In his desire to conciliate the Marathas he withdrew British protection from the Rajputs and left them at the mercy of Sindhia and Holkar. It was left to Lord Hastings to complete the overthrow of the Maratha power. During the Pindari War he isolated Sindhia, and bound him to give assistance to the English against the Pindaris. Next when Baji Rao II, Holkar and Apa Sahib declared war against the English, he defeated them all in detail and rendered them impotent for harm in future. The office of Peshwa was abolished and a representative of the line of Sivaji was placed on the throne of Satara. Holkar and the Raja of Nagpur were

mulcted in territory and were forced to acknowledge British overlordship.

***Causes of the fall of the Marathas:—**(a) The fall of the Marathas is to be traced to the disastrous effects of the Third Battle of Panipat (1761). The Marathas received a staggering blow which shattered them as a single power. The power of the Peshwa was gone and with it also vanished the unity of the Maratha Confederacy. Disintegration set in and the process was accelerated by the individual ambition of the Maratha chiefs and their rivalries. This disunion besides weakening the Marathas, gave the English an opportunity to interfere in their affairs. Thus, the quarrel over succession to the Peshwaship, which followed on the death of Narayan Rao led Raghoba to seek British help. Again, the Treaty of Bassien by which Baji Rao II entered into a subsidiary alliance with the English, was the outcome of the rivalry between Sindhia and Holkar. So bitter was their jealousy that the Marathas could not make common cause against their common enemy and the English crushed their power in detail. (b) To this general cause of decay may be added the mistaken policy of the Marathas in abandoning their guerrilla tactics in warfare which had once made them formidable to the Moghul power. They courted defeat by training their army on European model,—a training which was ill-suited to the genius of their people. (c) *Lastly*, it must be said that the treatment by the Marathas of the conquered provinces was oppressive and so their rule did not strike root into the soil. Their rule gradually degenerated into a system of organised plunder, pressing hard upon the people.

Effects of the Third Battle of Panipat.

Want of unity and jealousy among the Maratha chiefs.

Abandonment of the guerrilla warfare.

Misgovernment of the Marathas.

LORD AMHERST (1823—1828)

On Lord Hastings' resignation Lord Amherst was chosen as his successor. Till his arrival John Adam, a senior member of the Council, acted as

temporary Governor-General. During his short period of office Adam made himself notorious by his attempt to put restrictions on the press. After seven months he made over charge to Lord Amherst. The most important event of his administration was the First Anglo-Burmese War.

NORTH-EASTERN FRONTIER

Encroachments of the Burmese on British territory led to this war.

First Anglo-Burmese War:—In its origin the first Anglo-Burmese War was purely defensive, being caused by Burmese acts of aggression. About the middle of the eighteenth century a Burmese chief named Alompra conquered Pegu and established a strong dynasty. His successors extended their dominion in different directions and began to push towards the eastern frontier of India. In 1884 the Burmese conquered the independent Kingdom of Arakan and so came very close to Chittagong. Fugitives fleeing from territories conquered by the Burmese took shelter over the British border and used it as a base for making retaliatory raids upon Burmese territories. The Burmese demanded the surrender of those fugitives, but the British in Chittagong refused to do so. This rendered Anglo-Burmese relations more and more strained. In 1813 the Burmese conquered Manipur and in 1818 their king sent an insolent letter to Lord Hastings, demanding Chittagong, Dacca, Murshidabad, and Cassimbazar. In 1822 they conquered Assam and thus confronted the British all along their ill-defined north-eastern frontier. In 1823, they occupied Shapuri, an island off Chittagong belonging to the Company and in the following year projected an invasion of Bengal. Thereupon Lord Amherst declared war in 1824. The British plan of campaign was to capture Rangoon, and then march up the river Irrawaddy to the Burmese capital, Ava. Sir Archibald Campbell captured Rangoon but could not for a time proceed further up on account of heavy rains and want of supplies. Attempts to enter

Burma overland failed and Bandula, the ablest Burmese general, defeated a British detachment at Ramu on the Chittagong frontier. He was, however, recalled to march to the relief of Rangoon. Driven back before Rangoon, Bandula retreated to Donabew where he was defeated and killed after a gallant resistance. The English then occupied Prome and, after several other successes, reached Yandaboo and threatened the Capital. At this the Burmese were alarmed and came to terms. By the *Treaty of Yandaboo* they ceded the provinces of Assam, Arakan and Tenasserim, agreed to abstain from interference in Cachar, Jaintia and Manipur, made a commercial treaty and agreed to pay an indemnity of a crore of rupees. Assam, Cachar and Manipur practically became British protectorates, for the Burmese were debarred from interference in that quarter.

Treaty of
Yandaboo
closed the
First
Burmese
War.

Mutiny at Barrackpore:—A sepoy regiment of Barrackpore was ordered to proceed to Burma. They dreaded the loss of caste by sea voyage and had besides a genuine grievance in the heavy transport expenses which, under the rules then in force, they had to bear. Their humble prayer for the redress of their grievances was rejected and so they displayed an insubordinate spirit for which they were shot down.

Capture of Bharatpur:—Lord Amherst was forced to interfere in Bharatpur where the child Raja set up by the British Resident, was displaced by his cousin, Durjan Sal. British forces were sent against the usurper and the fort of Bharatpur, which had defied Lord Lake, was stormed by Lord Combermere in 1826.

CHAPTER III

Epoch of reform:—The Charter Act of 1813

1813 to 1856.

Company's
first grant
in aid of
education.

Beginning
of English
education.

Bentinck's
reforms:
social and
educational.

Freedom of
the Press.

may be looked upon as marking a change in the attitude of the British Government towards the people of India. Till now the British policy was dominated almost solely by imperialistic motives and commercial considerations. Nothing was done to promote the moral and intellectual advancement of the people. The Charter Act of 1813 saw the beginning of a changed outlook. While renewing the Charter, Parliament impressed upon the Company the necessity of taking measures for introducing among the people of British dominions in India "useful knowledge and religious and moral improvements." It further directed the Company to set apart the sum of a lakh of rupees to be applied to "the revival and improvement of literature and the encouragement of the learned natives of India and for the introduction and promotion of the knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories in India." This policy was enunciated at a time when benevolent Englishmen like William Carey and David Hare, and liberal-minded Indians like Raja Rammohan Ray were already at work laying the foundation of English education in India. Rammohan also took up the cause of social and religious reform. This caused a good deal of stir among the orthodox community but he continued his unwearied efforts. Lord Bentinck took full advantage of the new spirit of the age and added to it his own liberal and humanising policy. He abolished the cruel practice of *Sati*, suppressed the *Thugs* and improved the pay and prospects of Indians in Government service. The crowning achievement of his regime was the introduction of English education. The reform movement thus set on foot never lost its impetus till the time of Lord Dalhousie. Sir Charles Metcalfe freed the Press from all restrictions,

Lord Ellenborough prohibited the legal recognition of slavery in India and Lord Hardinge suppressed the practice of human sacrifice prevalent among the Khonds of the Hill Tracts of Orissa. The reform movement was renewed with fresh vigour by Lord Dalhousie. Besides establishing railways, electric telegraph and cheap postage he introduced significant social reforms. The most important of these was the legalisation of widow remarriage in which his most powerful supporter was the famous Bengalee educationist, Pandit Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar. Lastly, a very important reform was envisaged during Dalhousie's regime by the famous Educational Despatch of Sir Charles Wood. It laid the foundation of the modern system of education in India.

Abolition
of slavery
and human
sacrifice.

Social
reforms of
Dalhousie.

LORD WILLIAM BENTINCK (1828—1835)

Lord William Bentinck who had been Governor of Madras and had been recalled for an alleged failure to cope with the Vellore Mutiny, was chosen to succeed Lord Amherst. He was a man of peaceful disposition and liberal principles and was the first Governor-General who openly acted on the theory that the welfare of the subject people was the primary duty of the British in India. His administration was marked by many beneficent reforms which were conceived in an enlightened and humane spirit.

His reforms:—(a) *Financial* : The first duty that confronted Bentinck was retrenchment, rendered necessary by the wasteful extravagance of the First Burmese War. He reduced permanent expenditure by effecting extensive economies in both the civil and military services. The *half-batta* or the field allowance enjoyed by the officers, was withdrawn and the remuneration of the civil service cut down. These measures made him highly unpopular with the Europeans but Bentinck faced his task with noble disregard of personal unpopularity. *Secondly*, considerable addition to the re-

Retrench-
ment of
Civil and
Military
services.

venue was made by the revision of land settlements in the north-western provinces and by the resumption of unauthorised revenue-free lands in the permanently settled provinces.

Employment
of Indians to
responsible
posts.

(b) *Administrative reforms* :—Bentinck remedied the defects in the judicial reforms of Cornwallis by entrusting the Indians with responsible judicial and executive duties. The Indians were for the first time appointed as Deputy Magistrates and Subordinate Judges with decent salaries attached to their posts. He created a Board of Revenue at Allahabad and abolished the provincial courts of appeal and circuit set up by Cornwallis. The proceedings of those courts were very dilatory and so their abolition made for speedy justice. The office of the District Magistrate was combined with that of the Collector. A new class of officials called Commissioners was appointed to supervise the work of Magistrates and Collectors. He substituted the vernacular language for Persian which had hitherto been the court language. In short, Bentinck was the first British ruler to establish a workable and efficient framework of administration in India.

Abolition of
Suttee.

Suppression
of *Thuggee*.

(c) *Social reforms* :—It is for his social reforms that Bentinck is now best remembered. The most famous of these was the abolition of *Suttee* or the self-immolation of Hindu widows on the funeral pyre of their husbands. Another salutary reform was the suppression of *Thuggee*, a system of highway robbery and murder, carried on by powerful gangs who infested the roads in various disguises and strangled unwary travellers to death. The task of exterminating these ruffians was entrusted to Colonel Sleeman who organised an elaborate system to deal with this abuse and succeeded in breaking up the gangs.

Educational
reforms.

During Bentinck's administration a great controversy was raised regarding the medium of imparting education to the people as well as the

nature of education to be imparted in India. Macaulay, the historian, who was then Law Member, throw the weight of his great influence in favour of English which thenceforth became the medium of higher education. In 1835, a resolution was adopted that the funds granted by the Government for education should be devoted solely to the instruction of the natives of India in the English language and in western sciences. Bentinck established the Calcutta Medical College and the Elphinstone Institution of Bombay.

English
as the
medium of
instruction.

Foreign relations:—In foreign affairs and in his relation with the native powers Bentinck sedulously upheld the doctrine of non-intervention pressed upon him by the authorities at Home. As the result of this policy disorder and disturbances arose in Gwalior, Bhopal and Jaipur, and the Gaikwar assumed an attitude of open hostility; but Bentinck refused to swerve from his considered policy of neutrality. In cases of extreme necessity, however, he did not shrink from intervention. Thus, on the death of the Raja of *Cachar* without heirs he annexed the principality at the request of the inhabitants. He also annexed *Coorg* then ruled by a mad Raja whose ferocious cruelty drove his subjects to despair. The Jaintia Parganas were annexed because the Raja refused to surrender the men who had kidnapped British subjects for sacrifice. The misgovernment in *Mysore* led Bentinck to take over the administration of the State which thenceforth was administered by British officials till 1881 when it was restored to its native ruler.

Relation
with the
native
states.

Annexation
of *Cachar*,
Coorg and
Jaintia.

Bentinck kept on good terms with *Ranjit Singh* and did him honour by paying him a highly ceremonial visit at *Rupar*. The meeting resulted in a "treaty of perpetual friendship" with the Sikh ruler who agreed in his turn to encourage trade along the *Sutlej* and to respect the territories of the *Sind Amirs* with whom Bentinck had also concluded treaties. Bentinck's treaties with the

Friendly
relation
with *Ranjit*
Singh.

Amirs of Sind and Ranjit Singh were intended to counteract possible Russian aggression.

The monopoly of Chinese trade was abolished. **Charter Act of 1833:**—As the time for the renewal of the Company's charter approached, there arose a great discussion as to whether the Company should be abolished and its Indian dominions taken under the direct administration of the Crown. The Charter Act, as passed by Parliament, made something of a compromise. It allowed the Company to retain its territorial possessions for a further term of twenty years, but they were to be held "in trust for his Majesty, his heirs and successors." It at the same time deprived the Company of its remaining trade privilege, *viz.*, the monopoly of the Chinese trade. The assets of the Company were bought at a valuation and a fixed dividend charged on the revenues of India, was guaranteed to the shareholders for forty years. Thus the Company lost its commercial character. It remained only a governing body and was allowed to exercise its rights of patronage over Indian appointments.

Constitutional changes.

Besides changing the character of the Company, the Charter Act introduced important modifications into the constitution of Indian Government. It gave the head of the government the title of the Governor-General of India (instead of Governor-General of Bengal) and empowered the Government to pass formal Acts, not merely informal Regulations, for the whole of India. Madras and Bombay were finally subordinated to the Governor-General's control and were deprived of their legislative powers. A fourth member, called the Law Member, was added to the Council of the Governor-General and a Law Commission was appointed whose labours resulted in the drafting of the Indian Penal Code. The North-Western Provinces were declared a fourth presidency with a Governor but were shortly afterwards placed under a Lieutenant-Governor. Lastly, the Charter Act laid down the most important principle "that

no native of India nor any natural-born subject of His Majesty should be disabled from holding any office, place or employment by reason of his religion, place of birth, descent or colour." The Act thus reversed the narrow policy of Lord Cornwallis and set the seal of Parliamentary approval to the liberal policy of Bentinck.

Bar of race
and colour
removed.

Raja Rammohan Ray:—Rammohan Ray was the herald of the new age that was dawning upon India as the result of the impact of Western civilisation. An erudite scholar, well versed in Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit and English, Rammohan Ray was the embodiment of the new spirit that tried to envisage the best in the past as well as the present. He was a contemporary of Lord William Bentinck and was like him an ardent reformer. He was a pioneer of social reforms on modern lines. He founded the Brahmo Samaj in 1828 which besides preaching the unity of God, assailed many of the social abuses of the Hindu society. He denounced the rigours of the caste-system and sought to uplift the position of women. He thus struck out the two main lines along which all social reforms have since proceeded. He carried on a vigorous propaganda against the practice of *Sati* or self-immolation of widows, and his powerful support was a great help to Bentinck who abolished this infamous practice. His progressive views stirred Hindu society to its depths and provoked bitter controversies. He had to face almost single-handed "the dread and unbroken force of Hindu orthodoxy." Nothing daunted the Raja held high the torch of the renaissance spirit of India.

He was the
pioneer of
Modern
India.

Rammohan's activities were manifold. He was a pioneer of English education. He along with David Hare, a famous missionary, founded many schools to impart English education to the Indians and started the Hindu College which finally developed into the Presidency College. He sent a spirited protest to Lord Amherst when the

He was a
Champion
of English
education.

His political activity.

latter was taking steps to establish a Sanskrit College in Calcutta. He pointed out that what the Indians needed was not a knowledge of her ancient lore but a knowledge of Western sciences and philosophy. His political views were advanced and enlightened and he was a very able critic of the Government. His nobly-worded protest against the restrictions on the liberty of press has been described as a "land-mark in the progress of Indian culture." He organised petitions signed by both Hindus and Muslims against the Jury Act of 1827 which made an invidious distinction between Christians and non-Christians in the matter of judicial administration. In these respects he may be looked upon as the pioneer of constitutional agitation.

He granted liberty to the press.

Sir Charles Metcalfe:—The successor of Lord William Bentinck was Charles Metcalfe, one of the ablest of the Company's servants, who had recently been appointed as the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces. His short term of office is memorable for the abolition of all restrictions on the press. The India House censured Metcalfe for this liberal action and so the latter resigned.

History of the Indian Press:—The first English newspaper printed in India was Hickey's *Bengal Gazette* first published in 1780. It was suppressed two years after and the editor sent to jail for the libels he published on Mrs. Hastings and various people. Hickey's paper was followed by the *Indian Gazette* and several other journals. The censorship of the press was first instituted by Lord Wellesley during the French war in order to prevent communication of intelligence to the enemy. The same reasons led Lord Minto to impose more severe restrictions on the press. Lord Hastings abolished the censorship of the press though he issued rules prohibiting the discussion of certain matters. Mr. Adam, the temporary successor of Lord Hastings, deported the editor of

the *Calcutta Journal* and made the rules more severe and required every printer to take out a licence. It was Sir Charles Metcalfe who removed all restrictions on the press in 1835. From that time the Indian press continued to enjoy freedom till 1878 when Lord Lytton imposed restrictions on vernacular papers. Lytton's measure was repealed by Lord Ripon. During the disturbances that followed the partition of Bengal several political crimes were committed and as a consequence the Government passed a restrictive Press Act in 1908 and a more stringent one in 1910.

LORD AUCKLAND (1836—1842)

His Reforms:—On the resignation of Sir Charles Metcalfe, Lord Auckland was appointed Governor-General. The early part of his administration was marked by a few useful reforms. He developed Bentinck's plans for the promotion of education and the cultivation of medical science. He abolished the pilgrim's tax and released the temple endowments from all official control. He also took steps for the construction of irrigation works.

He suppressed an attempted rebellion by the Padsha Begum of Oudh, deposed the Raja of Satara for his treasonable intrigues with the Portuguese, annexed Karnul in the Madras Presidency for the attempt of its Nawab to wage war against the English and frightened Holkar into making necessary reforms.

His relation with the native states.

His Afghan Policy:—The Afghan policy of the British Government was mainly influenced by an excessive fear of a Russian advance towards India by way of Herat and Kandahar. Lord Minto's embassy to Kabul and his treaty with Ranjit Singh were meant, at last in part, to counteract Russian designs and the same reasons prompted Lord William Bentinck to keep the great Sikh leader in good humour by paying him

The Afghan policy of the British was an anti-Russian policy.

a highly ceremonial visit and renewing the treaty of alliance with him.

**First Af-
ghan War.**

**Siege of
Herat by the
Persians
then under
Russian
influence.**

**British
mission to
Dost
Muhammad.**

**Tripartite
treaty
against Dost
Muhammad.**

**Dost
Muhammad
was de-
throned
and Shah
Shuja placed
on the
throne.**

Lord Auckland's Afghan policy was also the outcome of the dread of Russian influence in central Asia. About this time Russia was aggrandising herself at the expense of the petty states of Central Asia and had acquired a commanding influence at the Persian court. Lord Auckland took alarm when a Persian army, trained and officered by the Russians, besieged Herat in 1837. He sent Captain Burnes to Kabul, nominally on a commercial mission, but really to counteract Russian schemes in Afghanistan. Dost Muhammad, the ruler of Kabul, received the English mission cordially and agreed to do all that the English demanded, provided the latter should exert diplomatic pressure on Ranjit Singh to restore Peshawar to him. Lord Auckland shrank from this step for fear of incurring the hostility of the great Sikh ruler. So Dost Muhammad turned to Russia and received an informal Russian agent to whom he showed marked favour. Thereupon Auckland determined to depose Dost Muhammad and to replace him by Shah Shuja, a grandson of Ahmad Shah Durrani, who had been expelled from the throne in 1809, and had since then been living as a pensioner of the British at Ludhiana. The Governor-General believed that as Shah Shuja would owe his restoration to British help, he would be friendly to the English and would prove a pliant instrument of British diplomacy. To accomplish his object, Auckland concluded a 'tripartite treaty' with Ranjit Singh and Shah Shuja.

Chief Events:—Having determined on war Auckland pursued his policy regardless of the fact that the alleged necessity for it had disappeared. For the Russians had recalled their agent from Kabul and the Persians had raised the siege of Herat. British troops were sent through both the Bolan and Khyber passes. Kandahar was occu-

pied and Ghazni taken by storm in 1839. Dost Muhammad evacuated Kabul and Shah Shuja was triumphantly conducted into his capital and solemnly enthroned. Garrisons were stationed at Kandahar, Jalalabad and Kabul to preserve British influence and Macnaghten and Burnes remained in charge of political affairs. Dost Muhammad surrendered and was sent down to Calcutta on a liberal allowance.

So far all went well. But the Afghans disliked Shah Shuja who had been imposed on their country against their will and detested the presence of the British army in their midst. Their discontent was further heightened by the licentious conduct of Burnes and some other British officers quartered at Kabul. Riots broke out in all quarters. Burnes was dragged out of his house and cut to pieces. The British troops became demoralised, the generals proved incompetent and Macnaghten, the political Resident, was forced to conclude a humiliating treaty by which it was agreed that the British should evacuate Afghanistan and that Dost Muhammad should be set free and allowed to return to Kabul. But Macnaghten was suspected of bad faith because he entered into questionable negotiations with rival chiefs. Hence he was enticed to an interview with Akbar Khan, son of Dost Muhammad, and slain. In spite of this, another treaty was made with the Afghan chiefs and the British forces surrendering their guns and stores, began the fatal retreat from Kabul. The forces, still 16,000 strong, struggled on in misery and privation through snow-storms and a constant hail of bullets from the Afghans. The retreat became a rout, the rout a massacre. Only one man, Dr. Brydon, made his way to Jalalabad where General Sale held out. General Nott also defended Kandahar successfully. Lord Auckland laid down the reins of office before the close of the War (1842).

Destruction
of the British
army
during its
retreat from
Afghanistan.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH (1842—1844)

Army of Retribution.—Lord Ellenborough, the successor of Lord Auckland, immediately on his arrival took steps to retrieve the British prestige. He despatched an army under General Pollock who relieved Jalalabad and marched upon Kabul. There he was joined by General Nott, who on his route had destroyed the fortifications of Ghazni. The British prisoners were rescued and the great bazaar of Kabul was blown up. This was an inexcusable act of vandalism on the part of the British. The army then evacuated Afghanistan. Shah Shuja having been murdered, Dost Muhammad was allowed to return to Afghanistan unconditionally and to resume the throne.

Close of the
First Afghan
War.

Criticism of Auckland's Afghan Policy:—The Afghan policy of Lord Auckland (who in his turn was inspired by Palmerston, the Foreign Secretary) was politically disastrous and morally indefensible. The fear of the Russian aggression was nothing more than a bugbear for the British frontier was then separated from Russia's sphere of influence by a ring of powerful states such as the Punjab, Bahawalpur, Sind and the deserts of Rajputana. Moreover, Russia's outposts were at least a thousand miles away from the Indian boundary and a corresponding distance from their base. Secondly, Lord Auckland persisted in his policy when the reasons for it, such as they were, had ceased to exist. The only, though a very poor, justification of his policy, was the siege of Herat by the Persians. But even this poor excuse ceased to exist when the Persians were obliged to raise the siege. Thirdly, the moral aspect of the policy and its execution soiled the fair name and reputation of the British. To attack Dost Muhammad was morally indefensible because he had never injured the British Government. As an independent ruler he had every right to ally himself with Persia or Russia. Lastly, in marching their troops through Sind and in extorting money from the Sind Amirs the British were guilty of flagrant violation of treaties recently concluded with them.

The Afghan
policy was
indefensible.

Conquest of Sind:—The attitude of the British Government towards Sind is a regrettable record of unscrupulousness and disregard of treaty obligations. The political relation of the British with the Amirs of Sind began in 1809 when Lord Minto sent an embassy to the chief Amirs and concluded a treaty "establishing eternal friendship between the contracting parties" and providing

Political
relations
with Sind.

for the exclusion of the French from Sind. This treaty was renewed in 1820. Lord William Bentinck had also concluded a treaty in 1832 by which the rivers and roads of Sind were thrown open to merchants and traders subject to the condition that no armed vessels or military stores should pass through the country. It was further stipulated that the contracting parties should not "look with the eye of covetousness on the possessions of each other." During the first Afghan War, Lord Auckland violated this treaty in the most cynical fashion by marching British troops through Sind and added injury to insult by exacting a large sum of money from the Amirs. In spite of these high-handed proceedings the Amirs abstained from open hostility during the Afghan War even when fearful disasters befell the British army. Lord Ellenborough went a step further and deliberately provoked a war so that he might annex Sind. Vague charges of disaffection were brought against the Amirs and Sir Charles Napier was sent to Sind with full civil and military powers. He forced upon the Amirs a new treaty compelling them to cede the greater portion of their territories and to give up the right of coining money. His other high-handed proceedings at last goaded the Balochis into attacking the British Residency, and Napier now got a pretext for the war which he was provoking. The army of the Amirs was defeated in two actions, *viz.*, at *Miani* and *Dabo*, and Sind was annexed to the British Empire. Napier felt no scruples in helping himself to the sum of £70,000, being the share of the plunder obtained at Hyderabad.

Auckland's high-handed policy.

Ellenborough's equally unscrupulous policy.

Defeat of the Amirs and annexation of Sind.

Lord Ellenborough's policy with regard to Sind and the high-handed acts of Sir Charles Napier, have been universally condemned. The case for the annexation of Sind was deliberately manufactured. The whole business was morally unjustifiable and was the outcome of blatant imperialism. Napier has himself observed in his

Criticism of the conquest of Sind.

Diary : "We have no right to seize Sind, yet we shall do so, and a very advantageous, useful, humane piece of rascality it will be."

War with Gwalior:—In 1843, Jankaji Sindhia the adopted son of Daulat Rao, died without any issue. His widow, Tara Bai, having adopted a son, a regent was appointed with the sanction of Lord Ellenborough. Tara Bai dismissed the regent and there followed a scene of intrigue and counter-intrigue which seemed too likely to end in a civil war. The danger of the situation lay in the condition of the army which was strong and turbulent and might join with the restless Sikhs, who were on the verge of an outbreak. Lord Ellenborough brought up troops as a precaution and demanded the reduction of the local army. Negotiations failed and the Gwalior army commenced hostilities. It was, however, defeated in two battles at Maharajpur and Paniar. A new treaty was concluded by which the army of Gwalior was greatly reduced and the affairs of the minor ruler was placed under a council of regency which was to follow the advice of the Resident.

Abolition
of slavery.

Reforms:—Lord Ellenborough prohibited the legal recognition of slavery in India, suppressed state lotteries, began the appointment of Deputy Magistrates and improved the pay and prospects of police Darogas. He was disliked by the Directors for his aggressive policy, his open contempt for the Civil Service and the arrogant tone of his despatches. Hence he was recalled in 1844.

LORD HARDINGE (1844—1848)

Social
reforms.

His Reforms:—On Lord Ellenborough's recall, Lord Hardinge, a veteran soldier, was chosen as his successor. The chief event of his administration was the First Sikh War but during the first year of his office he carried through a few useful reforms. He planned the Indian railway system, pushed on the designs for the Ganges Canal, promoted education and took steps for the

suppression of *Suttee* and infanticide in the Protected States. He also suppressed the practice of human sacrifice prevalent among the Khonds in the Hill Tracts of Orissa.

First Sikh War:—It has already been noticed that Ranjit Singh had all along maintained friendly relations with the British and had even co-operated with them in the First Afghan War. He died in 1839 and was succeeded by his imbecile son, Kharag Singh. Then followed for six years a dismal series of revolutions and assassinations. The army became all-powerful in the state and set up deposed puppet rulers at its will. At last in 1845 the army acknowledged the claims of Dilip Singh, a reputed son of Ranjit Singh, a child of five. Rani Jhinda, mother of the boy-king, acted as regent with the help of her favourite, Lal Singh, who became minister. But all were equally afraid of the restless and turbulent army and found their only hope of security in urging it on to challenge British supremacy. Either it would spend its energy in a career of conquest or it would be crushed in the conflict. So the queen-mother authorised an invasion of the British territory. The army felt elated at the prospect of victory because recently the British had been badly beaten by the Afghans whom Ranjit Singh had defeated on several occasions. Besides, the Sikhs apprehended a British attack on their territory because the British force on the frontiers had been reinforced and preparations were being made for constructing bridges across the Sutlej. Rani Jhinda and her advisers fomented this apprehension and so the Sikh army crossed the Sutlej, the boundary between the Sikh and British territories. Thereupon Lord Hardinge declared war in 1845.

The death of Ranjit Singh was followed by revolutions.

The army became uncontrollable and so was incited to attack British territory.

The first battle was fought at *Mudki* where the Sikhs were defeated by Sir Hugh Gough, the British Commander-in-chief. Next followed a battle at *Ferozshah* where the Sikhs were strongly entrenched. After a hard fight in which the Bri-

Chief battles of the war.

**Battle of
Sobraon.**

**The treaty
of Lahore
ended the
First Sikh
War.**

tish suffered heavy casualties, the Sikhs were compelled to retire. The Sikhs were again defeated at *Aliwal* and were compelled to retire across the Sutlej. The final battle was fought at *Sobraon* in which the Sikhs after a gallant resistance were decisively beaten mainly owing to the treachery of their generals. The British then occupied Lahore and compelled the Sikhs to sue for peace. By the treaty of Lahore the Sikhs ceded all lands on the British side of the Sutlej as well as the Jullundar Doab (the land between the Sutlej and the Bias). They also consented to a considerable reduction of their army and to pay an indemnity of one and a half million sterling or to cede Kashmir with half a million. The latter alternative was adopted. The English then sold Kashmir to Gulab Singh for one million sterling. The Government was to continue in the hands of the young Maharaja with Lal Singh as his minister, under the supervision of the British Resident, and a British force was to remain at Lahore for one year. In 1816 at the request of the Sikh leaders a new treaty was made by which the administration of the Punjab was placed under a Council of Regency consisting of eight Sikh *Sardars* who were to act under the direction of the British Resident. A British force was to be maintained at Lahore and twenty-two lakhs of rupees were to be paid by the Sikh Government for its maintenance. This arrangement was to continue until the Maharaja should come of age. Thus as the result of the First Anglo-Sikh War the British Government secured full control over the Lahore Durbar. This proved to be the prelude to the annexation of the Punjab under the next Governor-General.

LORD DALHOUSIE (1848—1856)

The successor of Lord Hardinge was Lord Dalhousie, a man of autocratic temper but gifted with considerable administrative capacity. He left a deeper personal impress on the destinies of

India than any of his predecessors since Lord Wellesley. The early years of his government were mainly occupied by the Second Sikh War and Second Burmese War.

Second Sikh War:—Lord Hardinge's arrangement for the government of the Punjab did not work well. The Sikh chiefs resented the control exercised by the British Resident. They justly attributed their recent defeats to the treachery of their leaders and so were eager for another trial of strength. The occasion for a rupture came soon enough. Mulraj, the Sikh Governor of Multan, being called upon by the government of Lahore to render accounts, tendered his resignation. It was accepted and the British Resident sent two young English officers with a small escort to install a new Sikh Governor at Multan. The officers were murdered and Mulraj went into open rebellion and regained possession of Multan. The revolt soon became general and so Lord Dalhousie declared war. The Afghans joined the Sikhs in the hope of recovering Peshawar.

Causes.

Revolt of
Mulraj, the
Governor of
Multan.

Lieutenant Edwards, with a small force locally raised, defeated the rebels in two engagements and compelled Mulraj to retire within the fortress of Multan. The British Resident at Lahore sent Sher Singh with a large force to besiege Multan but the latter went over to the enemy. Lord Gough, the Commander-in-chief, attacked Sher Singh at Ramnagar but failed to make any impression. He next met the Sikh army at *Chilianwala* in 1849. The Sikhs fought with great courage and determination and repulsed a British brigade with fearful loss. They captured four guns and colours of three regiments but could not follow up their success. They abandoned their lines and retreated three miles in good order with the loss of twelve guns. The battle of Chilianwala is generally described as a drawn battle but the balance of success seems to have been in favour of the Sikhs. The English, however, succeeded in re-

Battle of
Chilianwala.

Defeat of
the Sikhs at
the battle of
Gujarat.

ducing Multan which capitulated after a gallant defence. The decisive battle of the war was fought at *Gujarat*, a town near the Chenub, where Lord Gough retrieved his reputation by signally defeating the Sikh army. The Sikhs fled in disorder and was pursued as far as the Afghan frontier. Sher Singh and the remnant of the Khalsa army laid down their arms and the war came to a close.

Annexation
of the
Punjab.

Organisation
of the pro-
vince by
Lawrence.

Results:—The Punjab was annexed and Dilip Singh was granted a pension of £50,000 a year. The Khalsa army was disbanded and the people were disarmed. The annexation of the Punjab pushed the frontiers of the British Empire to the base of the mountains of Afghanistan, the natural boundary of India. The work begun by Wellesley was thus completed. The administration of the province was entrusted to a Board of Three Commissioners. But the Board was soon abolished and a Chief Commissioner was appointed to rule the province, the first man to hold that office being Sir John Lawrence. The Punjab was made into what is called a non-regulation province. The people were disarmed, slavery and dacoity were finally stamped out and a simple code of criminal and civil procedure was drawn up. External security was provided for by the construction of a line of fortresses along the North-West frontier. Roads and canals were constructed, the land-tax was reduced and every care was taken to induce the people to settle down to a life of peaceful pursuits. The willingness with which the Sikhs fought in the Second Burmese War and their loyalty during the Mutiny are ample proofs of the success of the British administration in the Punjab.

The ill-treat-
ment of the
British mer-
chants by
the Burmese
led to this
war.

Second Burmese War:—Ever since the conclusion of the first Burmese War, the attitude of the Burmese towards the British Government had been haughty and arrogant and so the British Resident had to be withdrawn in 1840. In 1851, the British merchants at Rangoon complained of ill-treatment and Lord Dalhousie sent a frigate to

Rangoon to demand compensation. The officers of the vessel, having detained one of the king's ships, were fired upon by the Burmese. As the Burmese refused to comply with the demands for redress and reparation, Dalhousie declared war in 1852. The operations were brief and successful. The great pagoda of Rangoon was stormed and the town captured. This was followed by the capture of Prome and the occupation of the whole province of Pegu. The king of Burma having refused to sign a formal treaty, the province of Pegu was annexed by proclamation (1852).

Annexation
of Pegu:

Thus, the whole of lower Burma passed into the hands of the English.

***His Annexation Policy:**—Lord Dalhousie had no scruples about annexation and he made annexations right and left in total disregard of Indian feeling and susceptibilities. His annexation policy rested on a threefold basis,—right of conquest, *doctrine of lapse* and the desire to extend the benefits of British rule to provinces misgoverned by Indian potentates. As noticed before, the annexation of the Punjab and Pegu came under the first head, the provinces being annexed as results of military conquest. A small portion of Sikkim was annexed as a penalty for the Raja's ill-treatment on two British officers.

Grounds of
annexation.

*But by far the greater number of his annexations were effected by the application of the doctrine of lapse. According to it, the dependent States passed back or 'lapsed' to the paramount power on the failure of natural heirs of the royal line. In other words, Dalhousie refused to recognise the right of adoption in the case of dependent States and held that the failure of natural heirs of the royal line in such States was a legitimate opportunity for annexing them. The States annexed by the application of this doctrine were *Satara, Jhansi, Baghat, a Cis-Sutlej State, Nagpur, Jaitpur* in Bundelkhand and *Sambalpur* in

Doctrine
of Lapse.

Orissa. In one instance, that of Karauli, the annexation was disallowed by the Home government on the ground that it was a 'protected ally' and not a 'Dependent State' created by the British.

Motives of Dalhousie.

Criticism:—The 'doctrine of lapse' was an assertion of the political suzerainty of the British East India Company. The policy of annexation based upon this doctrine was not invented by Lord Dalhousie. It was enunciated by the Directors as far back as 1834 and subsequently acted upon on more than one occasion. But it was a policy which exactly suited Dalhousie's imperialistic motives and so he applied it whenever an opportunity presented itself. As A. D. Innes observes, "Dalhousie's predecessors had acted on the general principle of avoiding annexation if it could be avoided; Dalhousie acted on the general principle of annexing if he could do so legitimately." In applying this doctrine he was animated by two main objects, *viz.*, welfare of the peoples of the dependent States and imperialistic considerations. He sincerely believed that British rule was better for the ruled than Indian. Secondly, these annexations considerably added to the profit and convenience of the British Empire. Thus the annexation of Satara and Nagpur respectively linked up Bombay and Madras, and Bombay and Calcutta. It was thus a measure of imperial consolidation. However advantageous this doctrine may be there is no doubt that Dalhousie was blind to the impolicy of its application. It gave a rude shock to the princes and chiefs and created a good deal of uneasiness in their minds. No ruler felt secure and the atmosphere of unrest and suspicion created by his annexation policy was largely responsible for the terrible crisis which soon followed, *viz.*, the Sepoy Mutiny. This policy had to be reversed.

Impolicy of the Doctrine of Lapse.

Annexation of Oudh:—Oudh was annexed in consequence of the persistent misgovernment of

the country. This drastic measure was taken by the express order of the Home authorities, and the last Nawab, Wazid Ali, was removed to Calcutta on a large pension.

Lord Dalhousie was not in favour of annexing Oudh outright. He wanted to solve the Oudh problem by taking over the administration and leaving to the Nawab his "nominal sovereignty with his palace, rank and titles." But he was overruled by the Directors who decided on annexation. The grounds of annexation in this case were chronic misgovernment and corruption. There is no denying the fact that under the rule of successive Nawabs the administration of that province degenerated into an "orgy of massacre and corruption set to music." Successive Residents like Colonel Sleeman and Colonel Outram, both of whom were opposed to the policy of lapse, reported that the condition of Oudh was deplorable and could hardly be worse. But it should be noted that the maladministration of Oudh was as much due to the inevitable result of the operation of the subsidiary system as to incapacity of the Nawab. The Nawab was saddled with responsibility but shorn of power, and this resulted in constant British interference in the affairs of Oudh. For the Nawab could not take any important decision without the concurrence of the British Resident. Hence the responsibility for misgovernment rested largely with the British who had thrust upon Oudh a vicious system. Secondly, the annexation of Oudh was a "gross violation of national faith" as it involved the repudiation of treaty obligations. Since Wellesley's treaty of 1801, Oudh had been kept as a protected Feudatory State with the Nawab's control over its internal administration. This treaty was now brushed aside without any qualms of conscience and no consideration was shown for the unswerving loyalty of the ruling house of Oudh to the British Government. Apart from moral and other considerations the annexa-

Criticism of Dalhousie's Oudh policy.

It involved breach of faith.

It was impolitic.

tion was, as warned by Colonel Sleeman, an impolitic step. He said : "It would cost the British power more than the value of ten such kingdoms, and would inevitably lead to a mutiny of the Sepoys." His prophecy came true in 1857.

Other Annexation:—Besides these acquisitions, Dalhousie swept away certain titular sovereignties which have ceased to have any real meaning. Thus, on the death of the titular Nawab of the Carnatic he abolished the title of Nawab and on the death of the Raja of Tanjore he abolished the royal title. Finally, on the death of Baji Rao, the ex-Peshwa, he refused to continue the pension to his adopted son, Dhondhu Pant, afterwards notorious as the Nana Sahib.

Berar was taken from the Nizam partly in liquidation of the arrears of subsidies and partly for the maintenance of the contingent force.

Dalhousie As An Administrator

It has been rightly said that as an administrator Dalhousie "has never been surpassed and seldom equalled." Every department of the administration felt the touch of his reforming hands and he improved what he touched. He reorganised the system of administration by beginning the practice of distributing administrative works among distinct departments, and got rid of many antiquated survivals coming down from the old mercantile days of the Company. A very important administrative change of his time was the appointment of a Lieutenant Governor for Bengal which till now was in charge of the Governor-General. This enabled the latter to devote more time to all-round improvements. The administrative arrangements which Dalhousie made for the two newly conquered provinces of the Punjab and Pegu in Burma were splendid achievements.

Of the social reforms of Dalhousie the most important was the Widow Remarriage Act which

legalised the marriage of Hindu widows. Another noteworthy social reform was the removal of disabilities caused by the change of religion. Under the Hindu Law a convert to Christianity forfeited his inheritance. This penalty was now removed by law.

Dalhousie undertook a number of works of public utility which did more than anything else to modernise India. He opened the first railway line in India and set up the first electric telegraph wire. He established a uniform half-anna postage throughout the length and breadth of the country. Formerly letters were charged according to the distance covered. These improvements in the means of communication served to consolidate the British rule. He created the Public Works Department and undertook several works of great magnitude such as the Grand Trunk Road, the Ganges Canal and the Bari Doab Canal. He gave effect to the famous Educational Despatch of Sir Charles Wood by setting up Departments of Public Instruction in all the provinces.

This Despatch is an important landmark in the history of education in India. It envisaged a comprehensive and co-ordinated system of education advancing by well-ordered gradation from the lowest to the highest stage. It recommended the establishment of a network of educational institutions such as primary schools, higher schools, colleges and universities, each leading to the next higher stage. To manage and guide these institutions a Department of Education was to be created in each province. Provision was to be made for inspecting the schools and giving grants-in-aid to those founded by private efforts. This despatch thus laid the foundation of the modern system of education.

Charter Act of 1853:—The Charter of the Company was renewed for the last time in 1853, not as before for a definite period, but during the

This Act deprived the Company of all its power.

pleasure of Parliament. The Company was to continue to govern India in trust for the Crown "until Parliament should otherwise direct." While renewing the Charter Parliament took care to curtail the power and privileges of the Company. The Charter Act of 1853 cut down the number of Directors from twenty-four to eighteen, of whom six were to be appointed by the Crown. The Directors were deprived of their patronage over Indian appointments as the covenanted civil service was now thrown open to competition. The position of the President of the Board of Control was improved and his salary was made equal to that of a Secretary of State. Appointment of Councillors, both central and provincial, was to be made with the approval of the Crown. These changes deprived the Company of the last vestige of its power and prepared the ground for its abolition.

Beginning of Legislative Council.

The Charter Act introduced important administrative changes. Bengal was organised as a separate provincial government under a Lieutenant Governor. The Law Member, who till now could speak and vote only when legislative business was discussed, was given full rank as a Councillor with power to vote on all business. The Council was enlarged for purposes of law-making by the addition of six new members called legislative councillors. These included four government nominees from each of the four provinces, the Chief Justice of Bengal and another Judge of the Supreme Court. The nominated members must be civil servants of ten years' standing. This expanded Council of the Governor-General may be called the Legislative Council as distinct from the smaller Council of four which dealt with executive affairs.

Estimate of Dalhousie:—It has been aptly said of the British rulers of India that "some were conquerors, some were builders while others were reformers, but Lord Dalhousie was all in one."

This remark puts in a nutshell the illustrious role played by Dalhousie in extending as well consolidating the British rule in India. His powers of work were colossal and he left the impress of his personality upon every department of government. His wars and annexations extended the boundaries of the British Empire in India. What is more, this extension went hand in hand with orderly consolidation. The list of his administrative acts and works of public utility is a long one. They served to modernise India and made for the efficiency of the administration. In a word, he converted "the stationary India of Wellesley into the progressive India of our own day." He was, however, a man of autocratic temper, quite ill-fitted to work with his colleagues and he rode roughshod over Indian feelings and susceptibilities.

LORD CANNING (1856—1862)

The administration of Lord Canning who succeeded Lord Dalhousie, is the story of the Sepoy Mutiny, its suppression and the consequent reorganisation of the Government of India. Before the outbreak of the Mutiny he had to deal with the Persians who had occupied Herat in 1856. The British Government took alarm lest the Persians should conquer Afghanistan and so sent an expedition to the Persian Gulf. The British occupied Bushire and compelled the Persians to agree to evacuate Herat and to abstain from interference in Afghan affairs. War with the Persians.

The Rebellion of 1857,—Was it a Mutiny ?

In 1857 occurred the great rebellion usually known to history as the "Indian Mutiny." There has been a good deal of controversy over the real character of this outbreak. British writers have persisted in speaking of it as a "mutiny" while some Indians at any rate have described this great rising as the "Indian War of Independence." The

It was more than a mutiny—a feudal revolt.

truth seems to lie midway between these two extreme views. It was the sepoys of the Bengal Army who began the revolt and did most to sustain it. So far it was a mutiny. But it was more than a mutiny inasmuch as it was backed by dispossessed *zemindars* and *talukdars*, princes and nawabs deprived of their states, titles and pensions, and by the soldiery and officers of the escheated principalities, whose occupations were gone. Hence Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has spoken of the rising as a feudal revolt. Thus behind the particular grievances of the Bengal Army lay more deep-rooted and impalpable causes of discontent and there were many others besides the sepoy who were interested in overthrowing the British rule. The conservative section of the people was seriously alarmed at the progressive trends of British rule, which seemed to threaten their ancient social order. Thus there was a widespread feeling of discontent even among those who were not sepoys and the affair of the polluting greased cartridges set the tender-box ablaze.

Not a national revolt.

“But if the outbreak was more than a mutiny, it was not a national rebellion against foreign rule.” None of the rulers of the leading States joined in the revolt. The Sikhs who had been subdued very recently, made no attempt to recover their independence. On the contrary they marched out to join the British force at Delhi. All the Indian sepoys did not rise against the British Government. Many fought side by side with the British force. Southern India, on the whole, remained quiet. Nepal sent a Gurkha army to put down the revolt in Oudh. It was only in Oudh and Rohilkhand that the revolt took on the character of a national rising.

Character of the Mutiny.

Causes of the Mutiny:—In its origin the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 was essentially a military rising caused by discontent in the Indian army. “But it occurred at a time when for various rea-

sons, there was much social and political discontent, and the mutineers were promptly joined by interested adventurers, who tried to give it a particular direction to suit their own schemes." The causes of the Mutiny may be summed up under the heads, *political, social and military*.

Of the political causes the most important was the annexation policy of Lord Dalhousie. His annexations and escheats by the application of the doctrine of lapse alarmed the ruling classes and a general belief gained ground that the British had embarked upon an unscrupulous course of aggrandisement. The withdrawal of the pension of Nana Sahib, the adopted son of Baji Rao, offended his countrymen and made him the most relentless enemy of the British rule. The annexation of Oudh and the projected removal of the Mughal Emperor from his ancestral palace gave a rude shock to Muslim sentiments. The land-holding classes were also sorely aggrieved. Bentinck's resumption of rent-free tenures had ruined many landowners, while the administration of Oudh after its annexation was marked by a total disregard of the susceptibilities of the great *talukdars*. Thus, a feeling of uneasiness pervaded the ruling classes and no ruler of a native State felt safe.

Political causes of the Mutiny.
Dalhousie's annexations created alarm.

As regards social causes it should be noted that the introduction of western innovations had unsettled the minds of the ignorant people. The spread of English education, the construction of Railways and Telegraph lines, legislations for the suppression of *suttee* and for the re-marriage of widows and the missionary activity fostered by officials—all these engendered a belief that the British were determined to convert the people to Christianity. The cry was raised that religion was in danger and designing persons made much capital out of the popular apprehension. Lastly, there were many unsatisfactory features in the Indian army that portended a crisis. The dis-

Social causes.
Lax discipline in the army.

**Military
causes.**

**Discontent
of the
sepoys.**

**Greased
cartridges.**

**Outbreak at
Meerut.**

cipline in the army had become very lax on account of the system of promotion by seniority only as well as by the transference of able military officers to civil posts. The sepoys were discontented as the constant extension of frontiers involved their service in strange distant countries. In such cases they demanded extra allowances and when these were refused they became sullen. The Bengal army was particularly difficult to handle from the number of high caste men in its ranks. They disliked menial services and dreaded sea voyage, which endangered their caste. Hence their discontent was greatly intensified when Lord Canning passed the *General Services Enlistment Act* which imposed on the sepoys the obligation to serve wherever required. The disparity in numbers between European and Indian troops as well as England's pre-occupation in the Crimean War filled the sepoys with confidence in their own power.

What fanned the smouldering discontent into a devouring flame was the sad blunder of the greased cartridges which had to be used with the newly introduced Enfield rifles. A rumour spread, that the cartridges were greased with the fat of cows and pigs with the deliberate object of defiling the Hindus and Mussalmans alike. Unfortunately, there was truth in the rumour and the sepoys believed that the British wanted to make them Christians. A general alarm spread throughout the army and the sepoys broke into mutiny.

Spread of the Muntiny:—Troubles began first at Barrackpore where the discontent of the sepoys was marked by the outbreak of incendiary fires. Then they openly mutinied and their example was followed at Berhampur. These outbreaks were quickly put down and the Indian regiments were disbanded. But the disaffection spread to the north and incendiary fire also broke out at Amballa. But the decisive outbreak occurred at Meerut where 85 sepoys of the cavalry regiment were sentenced to two years' imprisonment for

refusing to use greased cartridges. At this, three regiments broke into open mutiny, shot down their officers, broke open the prisons, released their comrades and marched off to Delhi. The mutineers being joined by the Delhi sepoys made themselves masters of the city and the palace, massacred the Europeans and proclaimed the restoration of the Mughal Empire by placing the aged titular Emperor Bahadur Shah on the throne. The capture of Delhi by the mutineers was the signal for a general rising in Northern India and the mutiny spread to Lucknow, Bareilly, Cawnpore, Agra, Jhansi, Central India, Bundelkhand and other places. Everywhere the mutineers killed the Europeans, broke open the jails and then marched towards Delhi. In Oudh alone the mutiny developed into a rebellion but in other places it was a rising of the sepoys only, the people in general remaining loyal. In the Punjab, Sir John Lawrence kept the Sikhs quiet. He disarmed the disaffected sepoys, enlisted new Sikh regiments and with their help quickly crushed all symptoms of revolt.

Delhi captured by the mutineers.

Lawrence's activity in the Punjab.

Suppression of Mutiny:—The most pressing need for the restoration of British prestige was the recapture of Delhi. The city stood a siege of four months before it was recaptured. The glory of its recovery was mainly due to the unremitting exertions of Sir John Lawrence, who took the risk of denuding the Punjab of troops and hurrying reinforcement to Delhi. The aged Emperor was taken prisoner and transported to Rangoon while his two sons were shot dead. Thus ended the last of the Mughals.

Recovery of Delhi.

The last of the Mughals.

In Oudh the mutineers were converging round two centres, **Lucknow** and **Cawnpore**. At Lucknow Sir Henry Lawrence was shut up in the Residency with all the Europeans and a small force of loyal sepoys. During the early stage of the siege he was killed, but the tiny garrison maintained a gallant defence till it was reinforced by Generals Outram and Havelock who forced their way into the Residency after desperate fighting.

Relief of Lucknow.

Nana Sahib's
atrocities at
Cawnpore.

But the mutineers were still too strong for them and Havelock and Outram found themselves besieged. Lucknow stood a five months' siege after which it was finally relieved by Sir Colin Campbell. The recapture of Delhi and relief of Lucknow broke the back of the Mutiny. At Cawnpore the operations of the mutineers were directed by Nana Sahib from his residence at Bithur. The British garrison, after a gallant resistance, was compelled to surrender on terms. Nana Sahib who pretended friendship to the British, promised to convey the garrison safely to Allahabad. As the English were being conducted to the boats, a murderous fire was opened upon them by the order of Nana Sahib and with the exception of four men who made their escape, all were shot down at the river side. The women and children were kept confined for a yet more dreadful fate. When Nana Sahib heard that a relieving force under General Havelock had routed his army and was advancing upon Cawnpore, he ordered the European women and children, about two hundred in number, to be slaughtered and thrown into a well. Havelock drove out Nana Sahib and arrived just too late to prevent this revolting crime. Cawnpore was next occupied by the mutinous Gwalior contingent under *Tantia Topi* who repulsed General Windham who was left in charge of the place. Sir Colin Campbell recovered the town.

At *Barilly*, the capital of Rohilkhand, the sepoys mutinied and proclaimed a Rohilla chief as governor. The latter retained power for about a year until the city was captured by Campbell.

Rani of
Jhansi and
Tantia Topi.

In Central India and Bundelkhand the leaders of the rebels were the **Rani of Jhansi** and *Tantia Topi*. The former had earned from Sir Hugh Rose who conducted the operations in Central India, the compliment that she was the "best and bravest" of the rebel leaders. Rose relieved Saugor and then took Jhansi after defeating a relieving army under *Tantia Topi*. Next he took

Kalpi, the principal arsenal of the rebels. About this time Tantia Topi and Rani of Jhansi united their forces and by a brilliant stroke occupied Gwalior. They compelled Sindhia, who had remained loyal, to take refuge at Agra and proclaimed Nana Sahib as Peshwa. Sir Hugh Rose marched against the rebels and defeated them in two battles in one of which the Rani of Jhansi, clad in male attire and fighting gallantly, met a soldier's death. Tantia Topi escaped southwards with remarkable celerity and became a hunted fugitive till he was betrayed into the hands of the British and hanged for his complicity in the massacre of Cawnpore. Nana Sahib was driven from pillar to post but his end is unknown. Thus ended the Mutiny.

End of the Company:—The most important result of the Mutiny of 1857 was the abolition of the rule of East India Company. The shock of this terrible crisis created a strong feeling in England against the Company's rule, and Parliament determined to transfer the Government of India directly to the Crown. Accordingly an Act was passed known as "*An Act for the Better Government of India.*" It abolished the Board of Control and the Court of Directors and substituted for them a Secretary of State for India with a council of fifteen members to assist him. The Governor-General received the additional title of Viceroy. Lord Canning was the first Viceroy under the Act.

Immediate results of the Mutiny.

The Queen's Proclamation:—The transfer of the Government from the Company to the Crown was announced to the princes and people of India by the famous Proclamation of Queen Victoria on the 1st November, 1858. It declared the principles on which the Government of India was to be conducted. The princes were assured that their rights and honour should be respected and that the existing treaties with them scrupulously maintained. The people were assured of religious

Its chief clauses.

toleration and declared eligible for public offices, irrespective of their caste or creed, provided they were fit for them. A general amnesty was granted to all mutineers except those who had taken part in the murder of British subjects. The proclamation ended with a promise of measures for the material and moral improvement of the people.

Change from the Company to Crown was in reality a formal change.

Critical Note :—Cunningham says that the assumption of the Government of India by the Crown was rather a "formal than a substantial change." The remark is true, for since the passing of the Pitt's India Act all real power had passed to the President of the Board of Control, and the Court of Directors had been reduced to the position of an advisory council. The privileges of the Directors were further curtailed by the Charter Act of 1853, which threw open the Civil Service to competition and thereby deprived them of their patronage of India. The Act also reduced their number from 23 to 18 and made six of them nominees of the Crown. The Act also contemplated the assumption by the Crown of the Government of India inasmuch as it renewed the Company's Charter not for any definite period as former measures had done, but during pleasure of Parliament.

Want of common object.

***Causes of the Failure of the Mutiny:—**The main cause of the failure of the Mutiny was the absence of unity of purpose among the rebels. They did not agree in aiming at any common political object. The mutinous sepoys of the Bengal army tried to revive the vanished glories of the Mughal Empire while Nana Sahib sought to re-establish the power of the Peshwa in his own person. The Rani of Jhansi fought for her own hand. Dr. Smith observes that "the jealousy between the Hindus and Muhammadans, the political rivalry between Peshwa and Padshah, and innumerable animosities of various kinds so divided the rebels everywhere that they never were able to combine effectually for the execution of a well-considered plan." *Secondly*, the Mutiny was, to a great extent, localised, being confined to a limited area. India, south of the Narbada, made no movement of importance. *Thirdly*, no leader of considerable capacity arose among the rebels; the most capable was a woman, the Rani of Jhansi. *Fourthly*, with the exception of the Begum of Oudh, the Rani of Jhansi and some minor chiefs,

No organised attempt.

Want of capable leaders.

none of the 'protected' or feudatory princes threw in their lot with the rebels. On the contrary the British received invaluable help from some of the Indian statesmen, specially from Sir Dinakar Rao of Gwalior and Sir Salar Jang of Hyderabad. *Lastly*, Lord Canning's conciliatory attitude did much to allay the feelings of the mutineers and to disarm their opposition.

The Mutiny 'a Fortunate Occurrence':—Sir Lepel Griffin says that 'Perhaps a more fortunate occurrence than the Mutiny of 1857 never occurred in India.' To understand the spirit of this remark we must shut our eyes to many painful acts on both sides and regard the Mutiny as a revolt of the old against the new, of Indian conservatism against aggressive European innovation. This conflict had to be fought out and if the greased cartridge had not supplied the opportunity of the struggle would have come a little later over some other issue. To quote Griffin's words, "The Mutiny swept the Indian sky clear of many clouds. It disbanded a lazy, pampered army, which, though in its hundred years of life had done splendid service, had become impossible; it replaced an unprogressive, selfish and commercial system of administration by one liberal and enlightened and it attached the Sikh people to their rulers and made them what they are to-day, the surest support of the Government."

The Mutiny was a revolt of the conservative spirit of India against Western innovations.

Results of the Mutiny:—The Mutiny brought about important changes in the administration and policy of the British Government in India. Its most important result was the extinction of the East India Company. India was brought under the direct rule of the Crown and an *Act for the Better Government of India* was passed, which provided for the administration of the country by "and in the name of the Sovereign through one of the principal Secretaries of the State, assisted by a council of fifteen members." *Secondly*, the British Government had to revise its old policy of

Doctrine of lapse abandoned.

annexations and escheats. The 'doctrine of lapse' was abandoned and the Queen's Proclamation declared, "we desire no extension of our present territorial possessions."

Constitutional changes.

Thirdly, the policy of centralisation adopted in the Charter Act of 1833 was reversed and the Government recognised new principles of decentralisation and "Indianisation." Thus the Indian Councils Act of 1861 restored legislative function to Madras and Bombay and provided for its exercise by Bengal and any new Province that might be created. The Act also associated Indians with the work of law-making in the Provinces by providing for non-official members in the Councils. "The Mutiny had revealed a lack of contact and understanding between Indian public opinion and the Government." The Act of 1861 sought to remedy this defect.

Government became suspicious and reactionary.

Fourthly, the Mutiny, left in its trail traces of mutual fear and distrust in the minds of the ruler and the ruled. Hence the Government became reactionary and more cautious in its attitude towards the people. The army was reorganised on the principle of "division and counterpoise." It was believed that the rising of 1857 was encouraged by the great disparity in numbers and strength between the Indian and European sections of the armed forces. This disparity was removed by increasing the European element and by diminishing the number of Indian soldiers. The artillery was kept exclusively in the hands of the Europeans. Gradually a distinction was made between martial and non-martial races. Its object was to prevent or limit the recruitment of those races who formed the bulk of the rebellious Bengal Army. *Lastly*, the Mutiny caused the British "to regard Indian aspirations with an eye that was more watchful and less benevolent than had previously been the case." Formerly the Government took the initiative in introducing necessary social reforms. The *Sutee* was abolished.

and English education introduced not at the demand of the people but despite their opposition. But now the Government became cautious and appeared more and more a retarding agent. The demand for progress now came from the people and this bore momentous fruits in future.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

Company's Policy Towards Indian States

Sir William Lee-Wanner has noticed three epochs in British relations with Indian States, *viz.*, that of the 'ring fence' down to 1813, that of 'subordinate isolation' from 1813 to 1857, and thirdly, that of 'subordinate union' from 1857 down to the end of British rule in India. In this connection it should be noted that the British policy in regard to the Indian States varied according to circumstances. It had to adjust itself to changing political conditions and so the Company could not adhere to any fixed policy at any stage or time. But the three epochs noted above afford us useful guidance in tracing the evolution of British policy in regard to the Indian States.

Three stages
in the policy.

During its early days the Company followed the policy of 'ring fence' or non-intervention. It tried to avoid wars and entangling alliances and sought to remain undisturbed within the ring fence of its territorial possessions. At this stage the Company shrank from the danger and responsibility of acquiring new territory. Thus it refused to annex Oudh after the British victory at Buxar (1764) and contented itself with an arrangement which consolidated its position in Bengal. It regarded the Indian States as sovereign powers and did not interfere with their affairs except as a position. His object was to make Oudh a strong however, did not rule out treaties and alliances when these were necessary as precautionary measures. Warren Hastings concluded a treaty with

(a)
Policy of
ring fence.

**Policy of
Warren
Hastings.**

the ruler of Oudh and sought to strengthen his position. His object was to make Oudh a strong Buffer State so that it might fence off the Marathas from Bengal. His wars against the Marathas and Hyder Ali were not a departure from the policy of ring fence. They were not wars of aggression but defensive wars forced upon him by the folly and mistakes of the subordinate Presidencies. Pitt's India Act of 1784 set the seal of approval upon the policy of non-intervention by declaring that "to pursue schemes of conquest and extension of dominion in India are measures repugnant to the wish, honour, and policy of this nation." But this declaration of policy remained a pious wish, more honoured in breach than in observance. The fact was that the British policy in regard to the Indian States changed according to the changing conditions of the country and the personal predilections of the Governors-General. Thus Cornwallis, though anxious to maintain an attitude of neutrality in conformity with the declaration of Pitt's India Act of 1784, was led to pursue an aggressive policy against Tipu Sultan. In other respects he on the whole remained within the ring fence.

**British policy
as declared
by Pitt's
India Act.**

**(b)
Subordinate
isolation.**

The policy of ring fence gradually gave way to the policy of 'subordinate isolation.' Lee-Wanner dates the beginning of this policy from the year 1813, but it was Lord Wellesley (1798—1805) who was the real inaugurator of this new policy. By his policy of Subsidiary Alliance he isolated many Indian rulers from all political connection with foreign powers and made them dependent on British sovereignty for external defence and internal security. He concluded alliances with some of the Rajput States, including "obedience" in his treaties as well as alliance. His subsidiary treaties established *de facto* British predominance over some of the Indian States. But in theory these States did not become subject to British paramountcy as they retained their in-

dependence in internal affairs. Hence the treaties of Wellesley were negotiated on terms of equality. His two immediate successors, Lord Cornwallis and Sir George Barlow, reversed his 'forward' policy and sought to limit the Company's sphere within a well-defined area, leaving the Indian powers outside the pale to their own quarrels and grievances. The next Governor-General, Lord Minto, on the whole followed the policy of non-intervention, but had to modify it on occasions specially in his dealings with the Sikh ruler, Ranjit Singh. He concluded with him the treaty of Amritsar by which "perpetual amity" was established between the two contracting powers.

After Lord Minto the 'forward' policy was renewed by Lord Hastings. He had been an opponent of Lord Wellesley's policy, but he had to revise his opinion as soon as he was placed in the maelstrom of Indian politics. The result was that he "was destined to complete the fabric of British dominion in India almost exactly as his great predecessor had planned it." He developed and completed the policy of "subordinate isolation." In his treaties with Indian States he used the expression *subordinate co-operation* which implied the paramountcy of the British power. His object was to render the British Government "paramount in effect if not declaredly so ; to hold the other States as vassals, though not in name." These States retained their internal sovereignty as a matter of form, but in practice they were subject to the frequent interference of the British Residents. In the petty States the internal jurisdiction was often divided between the Company and the rulers. Gradually the interference of the Residents increased and the Company began to assume increasing responsibilities in the sphere of internal administration of the Indian States. Thus Lord William Bentinck, though an avowed non-interventionist, took over the administration of Mysore on grounds of misgovernment and

Policy of
Lord Has-
tings.

Subordinate
co-operation.

pensioned off the Raja (1831). Mysore remained sequestrated till 1881 when it was restored by Lord Ripon. Bentinck also incorporated into the British Empire the small States of Cachar, Jaintia and Coorg on grounds of maladministration.

**Policy of
annexation.**

About this time the policy of annexation based upon the principle of paramountcy, was expressly enunciated by the Court of Directors. It was first formulated in 1834 when the principle underlying the 'doctrine of lapse' was laid down. In 1841 further stress was laid upon this principle and the Directors declared their deliberate policy not to abandon any "just and honourable accession of territory or revenue." This declaration exactly chimed in with Lord Dalhousie's policy and he implemented it vigorously. In the case of dependent States he refused to recognise the right to adoption on the failure of natural heirs and annexed a number of States, justifying his action by the claim of suzerainty of paramountcy. Oudh was annexed on the ground of misrule. Thus under Dalhousie the paramountcy of the British Government was established in fact though the "fiction of the Mughal Government" was maintained. This airy cobweb was blown away by the great rising of 1857 when Emperor Bahadur Shah was put on trial 'for rebellion,' deposed and deported. Henceforth British paramountcy became an established fact and the Government began to show an increasing tendency to interfere in the internal affairs of the Indian States. This policy has been called a policy of subordinate union or subordinate co-operation.

**Assertion of
the principle
of para-
mountcy.**

CHAPTER IV

INDIA UNDER THE CROWN

Section I

Lord Canning's Policy:—Lord Canning was the last Governor-General under the Company and the first Viceroy under the Crown. His policy was to heal, rather than to inflame, the wounds inflicted by the late Mutiny. Hence in dealing with the mutineers he sought to temper punishment with mercy and resolutely set his face against the outcry both in England and India for a ruthless and indiscriminate policy of vengeance. For this he was attacked with rabid hostility by the Europeans who in derision nick-named him 'Clemency Canning,' but he maintained his view with a noble disdain of popular clamour.

His kind attitude towards the mutineers.

Constitutional Changes:—The shock of the Mutiny brought home to the British Government the necessity of introducing certain constitutional changes. As noticed before the most important change was the transfer of the control of the Indian government from the Company to the Crown (Sec p. 121). But it was felt that something more was needed. The Mutiny had revealed the fact that the British Government was deplorably out of touch with Indian public opinion and as a consequence there was no understanding between the rulers and the ruled. Sir Bartle Frere pointed out the danger of continuing "to legislate for millions of people with few means of knowing except by a rebellion whether the laws suit them or not." Hence it was decided to associate a few influential Indians with the legislative business of the Government. The result was the *Indian Councils Act of 1861*. It added a fifth member to the Governor-General's Council and enlarged it for legislative purposes by the appointment of addi-

Transfer of Indian government from Company to Crown.

Indian Councils Act of 1861.

Its chief provisions.

tional members, not less than six and not more than twelve in number, of whom at least half were to be non-officials, *i.e.*, outside the ranks of the Civil Service. These additional members were to be nominated by the Governor-General and it was understood that most of the non-official members would be Indians. The function of this enlarged council was strictly confined to legislation. The Act also reversed the policy of centralisation adopted by the Charter Act of 1833 by restoring to the Governments of Madras and Bombay their legislative power. It also provided for the creation of similar Legislative Councils in Bengal, the United Provinces and the Punjab as also in any new Province that might be created. The Provincial Councils were enlarged in the same way as the Central Council.

Beginning of the portfolio system.

The Act of 1861 empowered the Governor-General to frame rules for the transaction of the business of the Executive Council. Lord Canning used the power thus conferred on him to introduce what is called the portfolio system. By it he delegated special business to individual members of the Council. Thus arose the separation of departments under individual members who on their own initiative dealt with most of the matters in their departments. Only the most important subjects were placed before the Governor-General, and in case of difference of opinion, were considered by the whole Council. Thus each branch of the administration came to have its separate official head and spokesman and the business of the Government was largely decentralised. This decentralisation of the business of the Government made for efficiency and dispatch. It was also a move in the direction of the Cabinet Government.

Beginning of decentralisation.

There is no doubt that the Act of 1861 was a departure from the old traditions of the British Government in India. As Professor Coupland remarks, "in admitting Indians to the councils and restoring powers to the Provinces a dual process of

'Indianisation' and decentralisation had been started which was to lead, stage by stage, to Indian self-government." The admission of Indians to the higher Councils of the Government was, no doubt, a forward step but it was not motivated by a desire to set up a representative system. The Government included a few non-official members in the Council to keep itself informed of popular discontent before it ripened into disaffection. The framers of the Act did not envisage a parliamentary government for India. The Act, on the contrary, represented a reaction against it. The enlarged council set up by Lord Dalhousie in 1853 had assumed a tone of independence and even criticised the executive government. The Act of 1861 was intended to put a stop to that. It forbade the transaction of any business other than enactment of legislation. In that sense it was a retrograde measure.

Another important measure during the viceroyalty of Lord Canning was the abolition of the old dualism of the Supreme Court and Sadar 'Adalats' representing respectively the jurisdiction of the Crown and the Company. In their place Chartered High Courts were established in 1861, one in each Presidency. At least one-third of the judges of the High Courts were to be recruited from members of the Indian Civil Service, another one-third from barristers of England and the rest might be recruited from among the pleaders of the High Courts or from officers of the subordinate judiciary.

Other Reforms—Besides constitutional changes, many other important reforms marked the administration of Lord Canning. The army was reorganised, and the Company's regiments and the Queen's regiments into which the European army in India had hitherto been divided, were amalgamated. The transfer of almost the whole of the artillery to the charge of the Europeans was a reactionary measure, being the outcome of fear

Establishment of High Court

Military reforms.

Financial reforms.

and distrust engendered by the Mutiny. The system of financial administration was greatly improved by the appointment of a Finance Member brought out from England. The first Member so appointed was James Wilson and after him came Samuel Laing. They introduced an Income Tax and other new imposts, enforced large economies in military expenditure and soon converted the huge deficit caused by the Mutiny into a surplus.

Legal changes

The laws were codified. The *Penal Code* drafted by Macaulay, became law in 1858, and was followed in the next year by the Code of Criminal Procedure. Canning improved the status of the tenants by the *Rent Act of 1859* which protected them against arbitrary evictions by landlords. This Act applied to Bengal, Agra and Central Provinces.

Foundation of Universities.

Of his pacific measures the most important were the withdrawal of the doctrine of lapse and the foundation of three Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. He also checked the cruel oppression practised on the tenants of Bengal by the European indigo planters who compelled the ryots to plant indigo against their will and interests.

Lord Elgin:—The successor of Lord Canning was Lord Elgin who died at Dharamsala in 1863 after little more than a year of office. The only noticeable event of his administration was a punitive expedition against the Wahabis, a fanatical sect of Muhammadans living on the North-West frontiers.

The Bhutan War.

***Sir John Lawrence (1864—1869):**—On Lord Elgin's death Sir John Lawrence who had saved the Punjab and recovered Delhi during the Mutiny, was appointed Viceroy. The first event of his administration was a war with Bhutan. The Bhutanese used to make raids into the British territory and kidnapped Mr. Ashley Eden who had been sent to negotiate on the subject of frontier

raids. They forced him under compulsion to sign a humiliating treaty by which the Duars were surrendered to them. The British Government repudiated the treaty and sent an expedition to Bhutan. At first the English were defeated but they retrieved their position. At last a treaty was made by which the Bhutanese surrendered the Duars in return for a yearly subsidy.

In 1866, there was a terrible famine in Orissa, The Orissa, Famine of 1866. which caused fearful loss of life. The Government failed to take any effective measures for relief, and Lawrence was guilty of negligence in not overruling his Council and the Bengal Government which showed a criminal apathy to the seriousness of the situation. A Famine Commission was appointed to consider the best means of combating future visitations and the principle Famine policy. was for the first time laid down that the officers of the Government were bound to take every available means to prevent deaths by starvation.

Apart from his failure to deal with the Orissa His internal famine the internal administration of Lawrence administra- was on the whole successful. He spent large tion. sums of money on Public Works and irrigation schemes, and established the sound financial principle that the money for reproductive Public His interest Works should be raised by loan instead of paying in public for them out of the ordinary revenue. Lawrence works and in always took a warm interest in the welfare of the the welfare peasantry and supported their cause as against of the that of the landlords. He passed an Act for protecting the tenants of Oudh and drafted a similar tenants. measure for the Punjab, which was passed at a later date. By the Punjab and Oudh Tenancy Acts of 1868, he extended to the cultivators of Oudh and the Punjab the protection which Canning had given to the ryots of Bengal.

With regard to Afghanistan Lord Lawrence His Afghan followed the policy of rigid non-interference in policy. the internal affairs of the country. This policy

has been described as one of masterly inactivity.
(*For details see p. 135*).

Section II

AFGHAN POLICY AND NORTH-WEST FRONTIER (1857—1894)

**The problem
of the
frontier
defence.**

The annexation of the Punjab had extended the British frontier up to the base of the Afghan mountains "but the boundary line was very variable and ill-defined." The belt of territory between this line and the dominions of the Amir of Afghanistan was, and to some extent still is, occupied by independent Pathan tribes. They are fierce and warlike, always ready to make destructive raids over the frontier districts, and so were a constant source of embarrassment to the Punjab Government. Punitive expeditions had to be despatched from time to time to chastise them. In 1863 Lord Elgin had to despatch an expedition against the fanatical Wahabis, but it was held up by a combination of tribes in the Ambala pass, and not until reinforcements arrived were the tribes defeated and their strongholds destroyed. Thus the question of frontier defence became prominent. It was complicated by the fact that the tribes in theory owed allegiance to the Amir. But in fact the Amir was unable to control them and was jealous of any attempt on the part of the British to do so. Hence the British Government had to proceed very cautiously.

**Two schools
of frontier
policy.**

The unsettled condition of things on the border gave rise to two schools of frontier defence. One section of thought, generally known as the "*forward school*", demanded the fixing of a scientific Afghan-British frontier and the subjugation of the tribal zone. The supporters of the opposing view pointed out that the cost of carrying out such a forward policy would be prohibitive, and that any attempt to subjugate the tribes would offend the susceptibilities of the Amir. They

argued that it would be better to retire to some convenient strategic line beyond the reach of the frontier tribes.

With regard to Afghanistan proper the question was equally complicated. The Amir sat upon a very uneasy throne. There were internal troubles arising from disputes about succession. Besides, he had to maintain a keen watch upon the rapidly advancing line of Russian frontier in Central Asia in the direction of Afghanistan. This was a source of uneasiness to the British Government as well, for it was feared that Afghanistan might before long come within the sphere of Russian influence. The Russian menace was no longer an idle dream. In 1865, Tashkand was annexed by Russia. Two years later a Russian Governor-General was appointed in Turkestan. Samarkand fell in 1868.

The menace
of Russian
expansion.

In 1855, Lord Dalhousie had negotiated a treaty of friendship and alliance with Dost Muhammad, the Amir of Afghanistan. His object was to ensure the safety and tranquillity of the newly conquered province of the Punjab whose western boundary marched along the territory of the Afghan chief. The treaty was renewed and strengthened in 1857 as the result of the good services rendered by the British Government in compelling the Persians to evacuate Herat which they had wrested from the Afghans the year before. The cordial relations thus established between the British and the Afghans proved to be highly beneficial to both. The Amir was freed from Persian danger, while his friendly neutrality during the crisis of the Mutiny saved England a lot of troubles.

Friendly
relation with
Afghanistan
during the
Mutiny.

Dost Muhammad died in 1863 and a struggle for succession ensued among his sons. Past experience had shown the danger of interfering in Afghan politics and so Lord Lawrence rigidly abstained from interference in the domestic feuds of the several claimants. His policy was to re-

Afghan
policy of
Lord
Lawrence.

Lawrence's
policy of
masterly
inactivity.

cognise the *de facto* ruler coming out successful in the contest, and to safeguard his independence against any foreign power without committing himself to a binding alliance with him. Hence in accordance with the fortunes of the war, he recognised one rival after another. This policy of cold-blooded aloofness has been described as one of "masterly inactivity" and was on the whole wise and cheap. But it offended the Afghan chiefs who found that British recognition was not an asset to be depended upon, for it swang like the vane of a weather-cock from one rival to another. Eventually Sher Ali subdued all his rivals and was recognised by Lawrence who made him a present of arms and money but refused to commit himself any further. With regard to the problem of Russian advance Lawrence perceived that the remedy lay in coming to a definite agreement between the Home Government and Russia. In other words, he wanted to remove the whole Afghan question from the province of the Viceroy to that of the British Cabinet.

Afghan
relations
under Lord
Mayo and
Lord
Northbrook.

Lord Mayo followed Lawrence's policy of "masterly inactivity" with conspicuous success. Although he declined to conclude a binding engagement which Sher Ali was anxious for, he won over the Amir by his personal charm and promised him normal support to be followed by gifts of money and arms when the British Government deemed it desirable. At the same time an arrangement was arrived at with Russia, respecting the boundary of the Amir's territory. During the viceroyalty of Lord Northbrook, the Central Asian problem became somewhat acute owing to the steady advance of Russia towards the northern frontier of Afghanistan. Sher Ali became uneasy and the capture of Khiva by the Russians in 1873 caused him great alarm. He sent an envoy to Simla and pleaded for a closer alliance with the British. Northbrook saw the reasonableness of his request and asked the permission of the Secretary of State

to help the Amir with money, arms and troops to repel an unprovoked invasion. But the British Cabinet refused to depart from the policy of non-intervention. Sher Ali was disappointed and annoyed and showed an inclination to make terms with Russia. -

At this juncture a conservative ministry under Disraeli came to power. If the Liberal Cabinet had been unsympathetic to the Amir's desire for protection and had pursued a policy of "masterly inactivity," the conservative ministry swung to the other extreme and precipitated a crisis by their energetic interference. Lord Lytton, successor of Lord Northbrook, was instructed to adopt a "forward policy" by Disraeli, the Prime Minister, and Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State for India, both of whom were apprehensive of Russian policy in Asia. (For Lord Lytton's Afghan policy *see* p. 141). The forward policy of Lytton was reversed by Lord Ripon.

Forward
policy of
Lord Lytton.

In Lord Dufferin's time the Panjdeh affair nearly brought about a collision with Russia but it was averted by diplomacy (See p. 164). The personal relations between the next viceroy Lord Lansdowne and Amir Abdur Rahaman were somewhat cool. The "forward school" again came to the front, and there was considerable activity on the part of the British up and down the frontier. A railway was completed up to the Bolan pass; English officers were sent to Gilgit, and from Gilgit to Chitral. The Amir became uneasy and for some time there was a risk of a rupture. Fortunately, good sense prevailed on either side and a commission was appointed under Sir Mortimer Durand to delimit the frontier between Afghan and British territory. Certain districts were ceded to the Amir who in return promised not to interfere with the tribes upon the British side of the line and also renounced his right to interfere in Swat, Bajur, and Chitral. The Amir was allowed to import munitions of war and his subsidy was

Frontier
activity
under Lord
Lansdowne.

Durand Line.

increased from twelve to eighteen lakhs of rupees. Cordial relations between the two governments were thus completely restored.

Section III

**Friendly
relation with
the Native
Princes.**

***Lord Mayo:**—Lord Mayo succeeded Sir John Lawrence as Viceroy in 1869. He was a man of charming manners which endeared him to the rulers of the 'protected' states, who had been repelled by the coldness of the late Viceroy. He founded the Mayo College at Ajmer for the education of the sons of the ruling chiefs. It was during his administration that the Duke of Edinburgh, the second son of Queen Victoria visited India (1869).

**His internal
reforms.**

The financial administration of Lord Mayo was highly successful. He had to face a heavy deficit left by his predecessor but he brought about an equilibrium in the finances by increasing the income tax and the salt duties and by enforcing rigid economy. His most important financial reform was the institution of the system of *Provincial Contracts* by which each Province was made responsible for its own finance within certain defined limits. A fixed yearly grant, settled for five years at a time, was made to each of the Provincial governments and the latter within certain defined limits were given a free hand in allocating and spending their respective quotas. Money saved in one department could be spent in another. It was a measure of decentralisation which ensured economy. Previously, the provincial governments had to depend exclusively on the Supreme Government for all money grants which were definitely earmarked for special purposes and could be used for no other. So they had little interest in practising economy.

**Financial
decentral-
isation.**

**Relation
with the
Amir.**

His Afghan Policy:—Lord Mayo succeeded in establishing friendly relations with Sher Ali, the Amir of Afghanistan, who had been much offended by the selfish policy and cold aloofness of Sir John

Lawrence. He entertained him at a Durbar at Ambala, increased his cash subsidy and supplied him with arms to defend Afghanistan against any possible Russian invasion. In other words, he sought to make Afghanistan a buffer state against Russia and promised general support to the Amir in case of a Russian invasion. At the same time by informal negotiations with Russia the Czar was induced to recognise the river Oxus as the northern boundary of Afghanistan and to admit the Amir's claim to Badakshan. Thus the integrity of Afghanistan was secured as against Russia's designs.

Lord Mayo was stabbed to death by a Pathan convict while visiting the convict settlement of the Andaman Islands (1872).

Lord Northbrook:—On the death of Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook was chosen as his successor. He was a man of great business capacity but the period of his office was uneventful. He lacked the personal charm of his predecessor and his cold, repellent attitude disgusted Sher Ali, who developed feelings of hostility to the English and showed an inclination to join Russia. An unpleasant incident of his administration was the trial and deposition of the Gaikwar of Baroda, Malhar Rao by name, who was charged with having attempted to poison the Resident. His guilt was not proved but Northbrook deposed him on the ground of his unfitness to rule. In Northbrook's time there was a bad famine in Bihar but it was successfully combated though with considerable waste of money. In 1875, the Prince of Wales visited India and was received with cordial loyalty.

Afghan
affairs.

Deposition
of the
Gaikwar.

Famine in
Bihar.

***Lord Lytton (1876-1880):**—Lord Northbrook retired in 1876 and was succeeded by Lord Lytton. The British Parliament having passed the *Royal Titles Act* conferring upon the sovereign of England the title of Kaiser-i-Hind, Lord Lytton in 1877, held a magnificent Durbar at Delhi in which

Royal Titles
Act.

Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India. The effect of this Act was to lower the position of the Native princes who sank from the position of allies to that of subordinate chiefs. It was, however, a formal declaration of a patent fact.

Terrible
Famine in
Madras.

Famine
policy of
Lytton.

Famine
policy.

While the gorgeous Durbar was being held in the North a terrible famine was casting the shadow of poverty and death over Southern India. It lasted over two years and affected Madras, Bombay, the Deccan and Mysore, and in the second year, parts of Central India and the Punjab. Owing to the mismanagement and the defective relief measures of the Madras Government, there ensued an appalling loss of life. Lord Lytton decided that the Indian Government should not, as in the past, deal with each famine as it occurred, but should lay down a regular policy of preventive measures. He appointed a Famine Commission whose report forms the foundation of the existing provincial famine code. The main principles adopted were that employment should be found for the able-bodied on relief works and that gratuitous help should be given to the impotent poor. More important still, budget arrangements were sanctioned for an annual surplus over the ordinary revenue partly for the establishment of a Famine Fund, and partly for the construction of railways and canals through districts particularly liable to drought through failure of the monsoon. Lord Lytton had sound ideas about the true principles of famine relief, *viz.*, freedom of inland trade in grain, the construction of railways and irrigation works for the prevention of famine and the planning of systematic relief works.

Financial
reforms.

The financial administration of Lord Lytton was sound. The Salt Tax, hitherto levied at different rates in different provinces, was in a large measure established. The barbarous customs line or hedge erected to prevent importation of untaxed salt from Native States into British territory was

abolished. An advance was made in the direction of free trade by remitting many import duties. The system of financial decentralisation begun by Lord Mayo was extended and developed. Henceforth provincial governments were given a share in the revenues instead of a fixed grant from the imperial treasury.

Lord Lytton passed the *Vernacular Press Act* which required the editors of vernacular papers to enter into a bond to publish nothing likely to excite feelings of disaffection against the Government. The measure was highly indvidious as the English papers were exempted from this Act.

Vernacular
Press Act.

His Afghan Policy:—Lord Lytton came to India, commissioned to inaugurate a new Afghan policy. He substituted a 'forward' aggressive policy for that of non-interference pursued by his predecessors. His objects were to bring about a gradual 'disintegration and weakening of the Afghan power' and to prevent Afghanistan from falling under the control of Russia. He held that the Amir (Sher Ali) should be treated as an open enemy if he would not declare himself an open friend of the British. He proposed to establish a British Resident at Heart and to send a British Mission for the purpose. But Sher Ali politely declined to receive the Mission, saying that he could not do so without granting similar rights to Russia. Thereupon Lord Lytton, as a preliminary step to warlike operations, occupied Quetta in Baluchistan by an amicable arrangement with the Khan of Khelat. His negotiations with the Amir were carried on in an insolent, provocative manner.

Lytton's
policy of
aggressive
interference
in Afghan
affairs.

Second Afghan War:—Matters came to a head when in 1878 a Russian envoy ignoring the protests of Sher Ali, reached Kabul and negotiated a treaty with him. On receiving this news Lytton insisted that Sher Ali should receive a British envoy, but the latter refused. Thereupon war was declared against Sher Ali and three ex-

The Amir's
refusal to re-
ceive a Bri-
tish mission
led to the
war.

Treaty of
Gandamak

Murder of
the Resident
and the re-
newal of the
Afghan war.

peditions advanced upon Kabul by the three great passes of Afghanistan. There was little effective opposition. Sher Ali fled to Russian Turkestan where he died. The British Government then recognised Yakub Khan, a son of Sher Ali, as the Amir of Kabul and concluded the *Treaty of Gandamak* with him. By it the new Amir agreed to receive a British Resident at Kabul, to submit to the control of British Government in his relations with foreign powers and to cede certain territories including the British occupation of the passes. But this arrangement displeased the freedom-loving Afghans who murdered the British Resident, Sir Louis Cavagnari, with the whole body of his escort, soon after his arrival at Kabul. This disaster brought on a renewal of the war. British forces were set in motion, Kandahar was occupied, and General Roberts defeating the Afghans at Charasiab entered Kabul. Yakub Khan had already taken refuge in the British camp and was removed to India as a state prisoner for his suspected connivance at the late massacre. Lord Lytton then sought to carry out his favourite plan of splitting up Afghanistan by separating Kandahar from Kabul and was working out details when in 1880 he was obliged to resign.

British
defeat at
Maiwand.

His successor, **Lord Ripon**, hastened to make friends with the Afghans by recognising Abdur Rahman, a nephew of Sher Ali, as the Amir of Kabul. But soon troubles arose as Ayub Khan, another son of Sher Ali and a rival of Abdur Rahman, inflicted a serious defeat on the British forces at *Maiwand* and compelled the vanquished army to take refuge in Kandahar. Kandahar was, however, relieved by General Roberts but the English evacuated it after which it was seized by Ayub Khan. The latter, however, was defeated by his rival Abdur Rahman who recovered Kandahar as well as Herat. The British Government recognised Abdur Rahman as the Amir of Afghanistan and

the latter in return for an annual subsidy agreed not to have any political relations with any foreign power except the English. Thus the Russian menace was removed from Afghanistan. Hence the war was not fruitless from a political point of view. The British forces evacuated Afghanistan.

Results:—Thus the spirited Afghan policy of Lord Lytton was a failure. His objects, *viz.*, the breaking up of Afghanistan, and the stationing of a British Resident at Kabul, were completely frustrated. The only useful result that followed was the British occupation of the strategical position of Quetta which secured the use of the Bolan pass. But this result, though important, was incidental and was not the main objective of the policy which was neither just nor politically expedient. Dr. Smith, however, gives credit to Lord Lytton for a policy which ended in disgrace and which was reversed by his successor and has not since been followed.

The Afghan policy of Lytton was a failure except for the British occupation of Quetta.

An Estimate of Lord Lytton :—Several events during the viceroyalty of Lord Lytton have cast a shadow over his reputation as a statesman. His Afghan policy has been universally condemned. The Vernacular Press Act by which he restricted the freedom of the vernacular press marked him as a reactionary ruler, while the great loss of life in the famine of 1878-80 had exposed his government to fierce criticism. Nevertheless he had many liberal projects in view and he brought "new and fruitful conception into the field of Indian politics." He advocated the introduction of a gold standard into the monetary system of India, and had his plan been adopted India would have been spared a great economic loss which arose from the subsequent depreciation of silver. He suggested the creation of a north-west frontier province under the direct control of the Government of India—a reform which Lord Curzon sub-

sequently carried out. He planned the enrolment of an Indian peerage and suggested the formation of an India Privy Council of Ruling Chiefs to advise the Viceroy. He took stern action against the tendency of the courts to pass too lenient sentences on Europeans who had assaulted Indians. Lastly, by the foundation of the statutory Civil Service in 1879, he attempted to encourage the recruitment of Indians for positions of official responsibility. "Many of his unrealised ideas failed of realisation because they were before their time."

He was the
most
popular
Viceroy.

Lord Ripon (1880-1884):—The political outlook of Lord Ripon was the very antithesis of his predecessor, Lord Lytton. "He was a true Liberal of the Gladstonian era, with a strong belief in the virtues of peace, *laissez faire*, and self-government." His administration is memorable for his sympathetic attitude towards the Indians and for his encouragement of their legitimate aspirations. Till now in carrying on the administration the Government had completely ignored the people. Lord Ripon wanted that the Indians should be trained to take an active part in the management of their local affairs so that they might in due course be fitted for self-government. This attitude, coupled with his sincere attempts to remove all disqualifications based upon racial considerations, gave him an extraordinary hold on the affection of the Indian population. As a consequence he earned a popularity unequalled by any other Viceroy.

(1)
Repeal of
Vernacular
Press Act.

Liberal Reforms of Lord Ripon:—From the outset Lord Ripon "was determined to take some forward steps in the direction of liberalising the Indian government." One of his measures in this direction was the restoration of the freedom of the Press. He repealed the Vernacular Press Act passed by Lord Lytton and thus freed the journals and newspapers written in Indian languages from restraints on the discussion of poli-

tical and social questions. Thus vernacular newspapers were placed on a level of equality with those published in English.

With regard to education his policy was to free it as far as possible from official control and to allow free play to the natural development of the local educational institutions. He appointed a commission presided over by Sir William Hunter to enquire into the condition of education. The result was that regulations were laid down for the increase and improvements of primary and secondary schools, till now neglected by the state.

(2)
Educational
reforms.

Hunter Com-
mission.

Lord Ripon is chiefly remembered in India for his sincere attempts to establish local self-governing institutions. The idea was not a new one. Municipalities had already been established in big towns but the municipal commissioners were nominated by the Government. In rural areas there were committees which managed local affairs such as sanitation, the repair and construction of roads, maintenance of ferries, education etc. Regulations had been passed, authorising the Government to levy cesses to defray the expenses of these local works. But the local committees were all under official control. Their members were nominated by the Government and they had an official chairman. Besides, the area served by these committees was too large. The result was that their members were insufficiently acquainted with the needs of different localities spread over such a wide area. Lord Ripon earnestly sought to remove these drawbacks which hindered real self-government in the local bodies. His plan as embodied in a Government Resolution of 1882 envisaged local boards with smaller areas and laid emphasis on the elective principle. In rural areas he set up a system of District Boards and Local Boards known as "tahsil" or "taluk" boards. Wherever possible the representatives were to be elected by rate-payers rather than nominated by the

(3)
Local Self-
Govern-
ment.

He intro-
duced elec-
tive prin-
ciple in local
bodies.

District
Boards and
Local
Boards.

Municipalities.

Government. In towns the powers and responsibilities of the Municipalities were extended, their members were to be partly elected and partly nominated and it was provided that their chairman should be non-official whenever possible. All these local bodies were given certain financial powers but the Government retained powers of inspection, of providing for neglected duties and even of suspension in case of gross default.

In extending local self-government Lord Ripon stressed its educative value. He put forward his proposals not so much with a view to securing improvement in administration as with the object of giving the people political education. In explaining his Resolution of 1882 he said, "If the Boards are to be of any use for the purpose of training the natives to manage their own affairs, they must not be overshadowed by the constant presence of the *Burra Sahib* of the district." Hence he provided for elective representatives and official chairmen.

(4)
**Ilbert Bill
agitation.**

One of the liberal measures of Lord Ripon excited bitter racial feeling among the European community in India and provoked something like Anglo-Indian mutiny. Lord Ripon sought to abolish "judicial disqualifications based on race distinctions." Till now a European British subject could be tried only by a magistrate or sessions judge of European birth, though in the Presidency towns this rule did not apply. But by this time some Indian members of the Indian Civil Service had risen to the position of magistrates and sessions judges and it was highly invidious that they should have no jurisdiction over Europeans. A discrimination of this kind between members of the same service had become an anachronism and Ripon wanted to abolish it. For this purpose a Bill was introduced known as the Ilbert Bill from the name of the Law Member who introduced it. At this the European community in India started a violent agitation, boycotted the Viceroy and

subjected him to something very like insult. In the face of the rabid hostility of the Europeans the Government was obliged to modify the Bill and to come to a compromise. It was decided that a European arraigned before a District Magistrate or Sessions Judge whether an Indian or a European, could claim to be tried by a Jury of which half were to be Europeans. The lesson of the Ilbert Bill was not lost upon the educated Indians. They learnt that the powerful British Government could be deflected from its purpose by organised agitation.

Lord Ripon took a good deal of interest in the welfare of the masses. He planned a Tenancy Act to improve the condition of the ryots of Bengal and Oudh and these were subsequently passed in the time of his successor. To protect the labourers in towns he passed a Factory Act in 1881, which restricted the hours of employment of children to nine hours a day, required that dangerous machinery should be properly fenced and provided for the appointment of Inspectors. (5)
Social
reforma.

Factory
Act, 1881.

An extremely popular act of Lord Ripon's Government was the 'rendition' of Mysore, by which in 1881 Mysore was restored to the adopted son of the Maharaja whom Lord Bentinck had deposed for misgovernment in 1831. (6)
Rendition
Mysore.

CHAPTER V

THE AWAKENING OF INDIA

Socio-Religious Movements

**Impact of
western
culture.**

The nineteenth century, specially the latter half of it, saw the beginning of new stirrings in the minds of the Indian people. The impact of western civilisation roused them from their medieval torpor and gave a rude shock to their cherished ideas and institutions. In every sphere of life they had to meet the challenge of a new culture which forced them to revise their orthodox ideas and to make a revaluation of their old values. With the spread of English education new wine began to be poured into old bottles. The resulting ferment began to stimulate thought and activity and to arouse new aspirations. Indians with English education gave up their attitude of uncritical deference to authority, tradition and customs and so became the pioneers of almost all movements of social and political reform.

**Religious
background
of Indian
Renaissance**

Mrs. Besant has remarked that in India any movement to be strong must rest on a religious basis. "It only throbs with full response when the religious note has been struck which calls out its sympathetic vibration." It is common knowledge that the rise of Sikhs and Marathas to political power was largely due to the inspiration of religion. Hence it is quite fitting that the dawn of the new renaissance in India should be heralded by great religious movements.

**Rammohan
Roy.**

A. The Brahmo Samaj:—The pioneer of religious movements and social reform in the nineteenth century was Raja Rammohan Roy (1772—1833). He was a brilliant product of the impact of western education upon Indian culture. "He was in fact the first modern man in India." A true humanist and a reformer he wanted to raise the

Hindu society from the slough of superstition and despondency. With this object he founded the Brahmo Samaj in 1828. It was a theistic organisation open to all who believed in the unity of God and discarded the worship of images. Rammohan's idealism was based upon the universalism of the Upanishads. The work begun by him was carried forward by Debendra Nath Tagore (father of Rabindra Nath) and Keshab Chandra Sen, a very powerful preacher. Keshab Chandra's fervent devotion, wonderful eloquence and missionary zeal carried the influence of the Brahmo Samaj far outside the limits of Bengal. Everywhere the Samaj had played a notable part as a reforming and uplifting agency. Its services in the cause of elevating the position of women deserve unstinted praise.

B. Prarthana Samaj:—It was in Maharastra that the influence of the Brahmo Samaj movement made an abiding impression. In 1867 Keshab Chandra Sen founded the Prarthana Samaj in Bombay and it counted among its members distinguished personages like Justice Mahadeva Govinda Ranade and Sir R. G. Bhandarkar. In Maharastra as in Bengal the movement was a rational unitarianism but the Prarthana Samaj laid greater stress upon social reform than upon theological speculation. Justice Ranade was an erudite scholar with a keen intellect and under his able guidance the Prarthana Samaj became the active centre of a new social reformation in Western India. He was one of the founders of the Widow Marriage Association and was an ardent promoter of the famous *Deccan Education Society*. Its object was to impart such education to the young as would fit them for the unselfish service of the country. Ranade was also closely connected with the foundation of the Indian National Congress and it was at his initiative that a social conference began to be held along with the annual meeting of the Congress.

Keshab
Chandra
Sen.

Influence
of Govinda
Ranade.

Dayananda
was the
apostle of
Vedic
revival.

Social
activity of
the Arya
Samaj.

C. The Arya Samaj:—The socio-religious movements represented by the Brahmo Samaj and the Prarthana Samaj were reforming movements inspired by western rationalism. But the awakening of India had a twofold aspect. It looked for inspiration not merely to the west but to India's glorious past and idealised it. Dyananda Saraswati founded the Arya Samaj in 1875 with the distinct object of re-establishing Hinduism on the pristine purity of the Vedic age. "Back to the Vedas" was his motto. He repudiated the authority of all the sacred books of the Hindus except that of the Vedas. He regarded the prevailing religious beliefs and practices based upon the Puranas as unhealthy accretions and distortions made by selfish and ignorant persons. The new movement rapidly spread specially in the Punjab where its educational activity met with remarkable success. Dayananda's was a heroic soul and his *Sudhi* movement (*i.e.*, conversion of non-Hindus to Hinduism) gave to Hinduism a militant and aggressive character. Though a revivalist he set his face against the prevalent orthodoxy of the Hindus. He denounced the taboos of the caste-system and the practice of child marriage. He encouraged female education and the remarriage of widows. His teachings fostered pride in the country and its past and gave the people a national outlook. As a proselytising sect with great urge for social reform the Arya Samaj is one of the living forces of modern India.

Ramakrishna
preached the
unity of all
religions.

D. The Ramakrishna Mission:—Quite different in spirit was the movement which derived its inspiration from Ramakrishna Paramhansa (1834—1866), the saint of Dakshineswar near Calcutta. He started life as a poor priest without any formal education, but soon developed into a divinely-inspired teacher of supreme spiritual truths. Of him Max Muller has said, "Illiterate Ramakrishna in comparison with whom the brightest intellects of Europe are mere gropers in

the dark." His pithy sayings and commonplace illustrations are marvels of lucid exposition. He practised different forms of religions to demonstrate their fundamental unity. All religions, he used to say, are but so many paths leading to the same goal, and all worship the same God under different names. His teachings did much to dispel the mists of scepticism and ultra-modernism which had enveloped the soul of Bengal. The Ramakrishna Mission, founded by his great disciple **Vivekananda**, is the living embodiment of his message and teachings.

Vivekananda was a man of dynamic energy and such was the inspiring force of his personality that anybody who listened to him could not forget his message. He wanted to combine western progress with India's spiritual background "Rooted in the past and full of pride in India's heritage, Vivekananda was yet modern in his approach to life's problems, and was a kind of bridge between the past of India and her present." He anticipated Mahatma Gandhi in preaching fearlessness, in denouncing untouchability and in his burning enthusiasm for the uplift of the masses. Under his inspiration the Ramakrishna Mission has adopted a comprehensive programme of social service. It has started schools, colleges, hospitals and has always been in the forefront in rendering humanitarian services to the people afflicted by flood and famine.

Dynamic
influence of
Viveka-
nanda.

Social
services of
the Rama-
krishna
Mission.

The most notable thing about Vivekananda was his flaming zeal for reviving the greatness of Hinduism and the motherland. "We must go out, and we must conquer the world through our spirituality and philosophy"—this was the noble ideal he stood for. He boldly proclaimed that the Vedanta was destined to be the religion of mankind. His powerful utterances gave young India self-confidence and proved a tonic to the depressed and demoralised Hindu mind. For the first time

Tonic effect
of Viveka-
nanda's
teachings.

in the modern age the Hindus felt that there was no reason to be apologetic about their culture and religion. At the Parliament of World Religions held in 1894 at Chicago in America he captured the imagination of all by his courageous presentation of the Hindu religion and its world-wide significance. In the words of Sir Valentile Chitrol, Vivekananda was the "first Hindu whose personality won demonstrative recognition abroad for India's ancient civilisation and for her new-born claim to nationhood."

Activity of
Annie
Besant.

E. The Theosophical Society :—The Theosophical movement in India was sponsored by Madame H. P. Blavatsky, a Russian lady, and Colonel H. S. Olcott, an American military officer. They came to India in 1879 at the invitation of the Arya Samaj and founded the Theosophical Society with its headquarters at Adyar near Madras. The movement they started was a Hindu revival in European garb. Mrs. Annie Besant came to India in 1893 and joined the Society. She gave a tremendous impetus to the revivalist movement then going on in India. The keynote of her teachings was that the regeneration of India could be brought about only by the revival of her ancient religious ideals. With that object in view she started the Central Hindu School at Benares, which gradually grew into a College and finally developed into the Hindu University. The Theosophical Society gave strength to Hindu revivalism and proved to be an important factor in social and religious reform especially in South India.

General
results of
religious
revival.

These socio-religious movements stirred Hindu society to its depth. They stimulated efforts, individual and organised, for the abolition of many anomalies and practices which cumbered the society and arrested its development. They gave people a new sense of self-respect and a new pride in the past and these in the long run proved to be important factors in building up a new India.

Section I

DAWN OF NATIONALISM

Indian nationalism is to a large extent the foster-child of western education. Macaulay in advocating the adoption of the English language as the vehicle of higher education in India had a premonition of the revolutionary potentialities of the experiment. He declared that the Indians "having become instructed in European knowledge may, in some future age, demand European institutions." "That day" he declared "would be the "proudest day for the English." After the Mutiny English education made rapid progress, specially in Bengal and the Indian intelligentsia began to draw upon the storehouse of Western culture. The latter half of the nineteenth century was the golden age of Liberalism in Europe, particularly in England. The study of the political classics of English literature from Milton to Mill planted in the minds of English-educated Indians seeds of Liberalism in its twin aspects—nationalism and democracy. Thus the educated Indians gradually became politically minded and expected much from the Britishers who had taken the lead in the world in supporting the cause of Liberalism.

Factors
promoting
nationalism.

English
education.

Besides English education, the consolidation of British rule in India created conditions favourable to the growth of nationalism. The different parts of the country have been linked up by a network of railways which provided new facilities for contact and communication. The unification of the country under a centralised political system and the imposition of a common rule of law gave rise to common problems and common grievances. These could be easily discussed in a common language on a common platform. All these factors, coupled with the new political aspiration aroused by the English education, formed the starting point of Indian nationalism.

Political
unity under
British
rule

Revival of
interest in
India's past
culture.

Work of the
Asiatic
Society.

Importance
of Sir
William
Jones.

Sense of
frustration
at the failure
of the Bri-
tishers to
honour their
pledges.

In the middle of the nineteenth century the impact of western culture at first produced something like intellectual anarchy, specially in Bengal. It had an unsettling effect on people's mind. Educated young men of Bengal showed their zeal for Westernism by crying down the civilisation of their own country. The more they admired everything Western the more vehemently did they denounce everything Eastern. But this attitude was gradually corrected by the recovery of India's past history and culture. In this recovery the name of Sir William Jones who held a high post under the Company, occupies an honoured place. He founded the *Asiatic Society of Bengal* for carrying on researches into the past history and antiquities of this country. The result was that the lost story of India's greatness began to be reconstructed by the patient labours of European scholars. The people began to realise that their ancestors had great achievements to their credit, and theirs was not a race to be despised and kept down. Jones who was a Sanskrit scholar, unveiled the treasures of Indian literature to the world. His translation of Kalidas's *Sakuntala* may be said to mark the beginning of European interest in oriental culture. The enthusiasm of Jones and other orientalists like Max Muller and Monier Williams for Indian culture revived the national esteem of India which had touched its nadir towards the close of the eighteenth century. European appreciation of Indian literature turned the minds of Indians to their rich cultural heritage which they had so long neglected. Thus was started the cultural renaissance of India which gave an impetus to the dawning sense of nationalism.

Political Background of National Movement

The post-Mutiny era was for the Indians a period of frustrated hopes and blasted aspirations. Educated Indians imbued with the liberal ideas of the West, expected much from British Liberalism. Liberal sentiments unequivocally ex-

pressed in the Charter Act of 1833 and reiterated in the Queen's Proclamation encouraged high hopes and aspiration in their mind. But they felt bitterly disappointed at the reactionary trend of British policy after the Mutiny. It was one of distrust and discrimination marked by the arrogant claim of the Britishers to racial superiority. In spite of oft-repeated promises to the contrary, the higher services remained the close preserve of the Europeans. In the army the Indians were deliberately excluded from the artillery section. The first royal visit paid to India by the then Prince of Wales in 1875 evoked great demonstrations of Indian loyalty. Shortly after, Queen Victoria assumed the title of Empress of India. These events were followed not by progressive measures of reform as expected by the educated classes, but by repressive enactments such as the Vernacular Press Act and the Arms Act. Lord Lytton cynically confessed that both the Government of England and India had taken every means in their power "of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to ear." Racism became the acknowledged creed of the rulers. Hence Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru writes, "There were two worlds: the world of British officials and the world of India's millions, and there was nothing in common between them except a common dislike for each other." The bitterness and a sense of frustration aroused by the British policy of racial discrimination were at the bottom of much of the dislike felt by the Indians for the Britisher. The educated Indians who had pinned their hopes on British liberalism were disillusioned.

Policy of
discrimination.

British
claim to
racial
superiority.

The same policy of discrimination was adopted in the field of commerce and industries. The British Government played havoc with the economic life of the Indian people by a policy which killed Indian handicrafts and prevented the expansion of mill industries. Embargoes were laid upon the export of machinery from England to

Economic
back-
ground.

India and individious tariffs were imposed for the protection of British manufacturers. No wonder that the country was impoverished and the people suffered untold misery in time of famine which was of frequent occurrence.

Surendra
Nath
Banerjee.

Beginning of Political Agitation:—In view of the reactionary attitude of the British Government the educated Indians realised the necessity of organising their political life. The lead in this matter was taken by Surendra Nath Banerjee who has been rightly described as the father of nationalist agitation in India. When he passed the I. C. S. Examination attempts, although unsuccessful, were made to remove his name from the list. Soon after his appointment the Government dismissed him on inadequate grounds. This dismissed member of the "heaven-born" service was destined to be the most popular among the pioneers of national movement. He took to politics and journalism and in 1876 founded the *Indian Association* with the object of making it the centre of an all-India movement. This Association animated as it was by the vision of a united India, proved to be the precursor of the National Congress. It focused public attention on India's problems and thereby helped to create a body of public opinion.

The Indian
Association
—1876.

Its impor-
tance.

Civil
Service
agitation.

Surendra Nath's opportunity came when the Secretary of State reduced the maximum age-limit for the Civil Service examination from twenty-one to nineteen. This measure, as Surendra Nath said, was "a deliberate attempt to blast the prospects of Indian candidates for the Indian Civil Service." The Indian Association organised a national protest against this measure. Surendra Nath undertook a whirlwind tour of Northern India in the course of which he addressed crowded meetings at important places. His superb oratory deeply moved the audience and everywhere he was received with great enthusiasm. His tour in the words of Sir H. Cotton "assumed the character of

a triumphal progress." The Association next organised an all-India memorial to the House of Commons with a prayer not to lower the age-limit for the Civil Service examination and to hold simultaneous examinations in England and India. Mr. Lalmohan Ghose, a barrister, was deputed to England to present the memorial in person. His speeches made profound impression on the British audience and the result was the creation of Statutory Civil Service for India. The Civil Service agitation was soon followed by agitations for the repeal for the Vernacular Press Act and Arms Act, the two measures of Lord Lytton, which made an invidious distinction between Indians and Europeans. All these agitations roused the political consciousness of the people and began to shape their national aspirations.

The national movement received a great impetus from the fierce agitation set up by the European community against the Ilbert Bill of 1883. This Bill sought to remove certain racial inequalities by empowering India magistrates in districts to try European British subjects. The prospect of being tried by "black magistrates" produced a terrible explosion of racial feeling among the Europeans. So violent was the agitation which they organised that Lord Ripon was compelled to whittle down the Bill. The success of the Anglo-Indian agitation was a lesson and warning to the Indians. They learnt that organised agitation could deflect the Government from its purpose. The racial feeling of the Europeans was revealed in its grim nakedness and it evoked a corresponding racial feeling in the minds of the Indians. "The passionate claim of the Europeans to predominance was to be answered by the passionate claim of the Indians to equality." As before Surendra Nath took the lead in the matter and set up an association known as the *Indian National Conference* (1883) for the discussion of all sorts of political problems. It met in Calcutta and was attended by representatives from different

Effects
of the
Ilbert
Bill
agitation.

Surendra
Nath sets up
the Indian
National
Conference
—1883.

parts of India. This was the first all-India political organisation and was the direct precedent of the National Congress.

The initiative was taken by A. O. Hume, a retired Civilian.

Attitude of Lord Dufferin.

Birth of the Congress:—Perceiving the increasing intensity of the Indian feelings A. O. Hume, a retired Civilian, wanted to divert them into a constitutional channel. He feared that unless a safe outlet was found the discontent of the people would fester beneath the surface and will eventually lead to dangerous consequences. In a letter addressed to the graduates of Calcutta University he exhorted them to found an organisation for the moral, material and political progress of their Motherland. He enlisted official support for his proposal. Lord Dufferin encouraged the formation of some responsible organisation through which the "Government might be kept informed regarding the best Indian public opinion." He was convinced that India needed a political organisation which would perform the functions "which Her Majesty's opposition did in England." Accordingly Mr. Hume's plan was taken up by some prominent Indians and the Indian National Congress was ushered into existence in December 1885. It met at Bombay under the presidency of Mr. W. C. Banerjee, a prominent Bengali barrister, and was attended by only seventy-two delegates. The paucity of attendance was due to the fact that Surendranath and other prominent leaders could not attend the Congress because of the simultaneous session of the Indian National Conference in Calcutta. As the two organisations had the same objects in view, the separate existence of the Indian National Conference was no longer necessary and so it merged itself into the National Congress. It was arranged that the Congress should meet every year during the Christmas week in some important town by turns.

In the beginning the Congress was not anti-British. On the contrary, it was profuse in its

expression of loyalty to the British Raj. Its members recognised the benefits conferred by the British rule and had unerving faith in British liberalism and justice. With such a loyal body the British Government could have no quarrel. Hence at first many Government officials attended the meetings of the Congress and even took part in their deliberations. When the second session of the Congress was held in Calcutta (1886) the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, received some of the members as "distinguished visitors to the Capital." In the third session at Madras the delegates were honoured by the Governor who entertained them at a garden party.

The attitude of the British Government was at first sympathetic.

For about twenty years (1885—1905) after its establishment the Congress activity was confined to the criticism of the policy of the Government and to demands for specific constitutional advances along the parliamentary road. It demanded the abolition of the India Council, the reform and expansion of the legislature both central and provincial, the separation of the executive and the judiciary, larger employment of Indians in the higher services by holding simultaneous I. C. S. examinations in England and India, reduction of military expenditure, relaxation of the Arms Act etc. These objects were to be achieved by constitutional means, by organised agitations on constitutional lines. The Congress leaders of this time had almost a pathetic belief in the efficacy of moral pressure on the British authorities. They held that the Britishers were by tradition the champions of popular liberties and as such would concede reforms if the case of India was properly represented before them. They did not blame the British people but the Anglo-Indian system on the spot—the autocratic bureaucracy. Hence session after session the Congress went on criticising, remonstrating, petitioning and agitating. Such agitations were not fruitless. They focused the attention of the educated community on the poli-

The programme of the Congress.

Constitutional agitation.

tical and economic problems of the time and thereby aroused public interest in the question of the country's regeneration. But many had misgivings about a movement whose success depended upon the goodwill of the class against which it was directed.

**Change in
the official
attitude.**

The official attitude of sympathy was soon disturbed by the "growing self-assurance of Congress demands." Lord Dufferin on the eve of his retirement spoke of the Congress as a "microscopic minority." Another ex-Viceroy (Lord Lytton) declared that the members of the Congress "represent nothing but the social anomaly of their own position." It is no doubt true that the Congress was the handiwork of a few educated Indians—"Indians in blood and colour but English in taste and opinions." Superficially it may appear anomalous that such a small anglicised community should claim to represent the dumb millions of their countrymen who knew little of politics and cared less for it. But it should be noted that these educated Indians formed the aristocracy of the country's intellect and as such were the natural spokesmen of the illiterate masses. True, they were a minority, but an intelligent and vigorous minority. It is the lesson of history that such a minority have time and again decided the fate of a nation. The British officials grew uneasy and began to look askance at the Congress. Gradually they kept away from it.

**Congress,
"a micro-
scopic mino-
rity."**

The Congress soon extended its activity to England in order to educate British public opinion. It employed all the paraphernalia of constitutional agitation such as meetings, lectures, distribution of pamphlets etc. The agitation bore fruit. The Labour Leader, Charles Bradlaugh who had attended the fifth session of the Congress in Bombay, moved a Bill in the House of Commons for the reform and expansion of the Legislative Councils of India. At this the die-hard Tories were forced into

action. To counteract the Bill of Mr. Bradlaugh Parliament passed the Indian Councils Act in 1892 in order to placate the educated class in India. This political concession was thus an indirect achievement of the Congress. (See p. 169).

RISE OF MUSLIM POLITICS

It is unfortunate that the Muslims as a community were indifferent to the Congress movement. Some Muslim leaders, it is true, attended the Congress and a few of them were elected Presidents, but as a class they held aloof. Several factors were at work, which determined their attitude towards the Congress and gave a separatist turn to their politics.

First, it should be noted that the Muslims were heavily depressed by the consolidation of the British rule in Northern India. It was a great blow to their pride and self-respect to find themselves ousted from all positions of power and authority. The last vestige of their influence in administration was gone when vernacular was substituted for Persian as the court language. The ardent spirits among them brooded over the past in sullen resentment. They hated British rule and western culture and were in turn looked upon with suspicion by the Government. Hence they supported Wahabi revivalism which was definitely anti-British and took a prominent part in the great upheaval of 1857, in the hope of restoring the fallen fortunes of their community. After the collapse of that rebellion their condition worsened and they felt still more down-hearted.

Decline in the position of the Muslims.

Secondly, Muslim orthodoxy had turned its back on English education as un-Islamic. Hence the Muslims failed to share in the intellectual renaissance brought about by western thought and science and conveyed through the English language. As a consequence all avenues of preferment thrown open by English education, were closed to them. The Hindus on the other hand forged

Indifference to English education.

ahead and by their progressive trends began to outstrip the Muslims in every walk of life. This heightened their sense of frustration and the Muslims began to think that the Hindus had stolen a march upon them.

Work of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, for the uplift of the Muslims.

M. A. O. College at Aligarh.

Aligarh movement.

The man who did most to raise the Muslim community from the slough of despair and depression was Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. His father held an office of rank in the Mughal court and he joined the service of the Company as a judicial officer in a subordinate capacity. He clearly realised that if the Muslims were to retrieve their lost position they must have English education and win the support of the British Government. So he set himself to woo the British and to persuade his co-religionists to reconsider their attitude towards English education. In 1875 he founded the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, destined one day to become the Muslim University of Aligarh. This was his greatest service to his community. His college not only promoted higher education among the Muslims but fostered a spirit of solidarity by giving them a common ideology. The British Government exploited the new outlook of the Muslim community and began to patronise the Aligarh movement. Theodore Beck, Principal of the M. A. O. College, gave to the institution a distinctly communal turn and a missionary spirit. Henceforth the 'Aligarh man' became the symbol of Muslim solidarity and the spearhead of Muslim movement everywhere in India.

Reasons why Sir Syed was opposed to Congress movement.

Sir Syed kept aloof from the Congress and did his best to wean away his fellow-Muslims from the national movement. He did so not from any unpatriotic motive. He felt that the Congress demand for representative government would injure the interests of the Muslims who in India formed a small minority. In 1883 he declared in the Governor-General's Council that "the system of election, pure and simple, cannot safely be

adopted. The larger community would totally override the interests of the smaller community." Sir Syed thought that the interests of his community would be better served by co-operation with the British Government than by opposition to it. Hence he courted the support of the British authorities by setting up several Anglo-Muslim associations as rival organisations to the Congress. All these proved short-lived but they indicated the lines along which the awakening of the Muslims was to develop. The fear of majority rule first expressed by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was echoed half a century later by Mr. Jinnah who became nervous about what he called the "brute majority" of the Congress. This fear-complex, adroitly manipulated by the British Government, led to the successive Muslim demands for weightage, separate electorates and lastly Pakistan.

Sir Syed was opposed to representative government.

The Muslim League:—The communal bent given to the Muslim politics by Sir Syed and Principal Beck was sedulously nursed by the British authorities. The technique of British rule in India was to encourage the fissiparous tendencies arising from religion and provincialism. The British Government wanted to utilise Muslim communalism as a counterpoise to the growing Indian nationalism which was largely the product of Hindu patriotism. Hence in 1906 some of the high British officials engineered a Muslim deputation to the Viceroy, Lord Minto, to promote the cause of Muslim separatism. It was led by H. H. the Aga Khan, the spiritual head of the Khoja Community. It made a strong claim for communal representation with which the Viceroy expressed complete sympathy. The members of the deputation were entertained by the Viceroy at a garden party at Simla and he wrote about the day as a "very eventful day" and an "epoch in Indian history." A high official sent a congratulatory message to the Viceroy saying "that a very, very big thing has happened.....It is nothing less than the

Muslim separatism was nursed by British officials.

pulling back of sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition."

The Muslim League started in 1906.

Encouraged by the success of the Muslim deputation Nawab Salimulla Khan of Dacca founded the Muslim League in 1906 with the object of promoting the loyalty of the Muslims to the British Government and of safeguarding their political and other rights. Without prejudice to these objects the establishment of friendly feelings between Muslims and other communities was also aimed at. Lord Morley, his radical views notwithstanding, welcomed the official nursing of the Muslim League as a "native opposition" to the Congress.

Section II

LORD DUFFERIN (1884-88)

Lord Dufferin who succeeded Lord Ripon as the Viceroy of India was a man of great tact, personal charm and diplomatic experience. He was, therefore, well fitted to allay the storm of bitter feeling which had been aroused by the controversy over the Ilbert Bill. (*See p. 157*).

Afghan affairs.

Immediately after his assumption of office he was confronted with the perennial Afghan question. Lord Lytton's Afghan policy, though ill-advised and unsuccessful, had the effect of checking Russian designs upon Afghanistan. The Amir had agreed to be guided in foreign affairs by British advice. The Russians, however, steadily advanced in Central Asia. In 1884 Merv, a town about 150 miles from the Afghan frontier, fell into their hands. This made the British Government very uneasy. To allay British suspicion the Russians proposed a joint Commission to demarcate the northern boundary of Afghanistan. This proposal was accepted by Lord Ripon and Commissioners were appointed on both sides. But before long a serious crisis arose with which his successor, Lord Dufferin, had to deal. The Russians purposely delayed to send the Commissioners

Russian advance in Central Asia.

and in the meantime their troops drove off the Afghans from Panjdeh and occupied it. This Panjdeh incident threatened war. England was pledged to defend the integrity of Afghanistan. But it was averted by diplomacy and by the good sense of Amir Abdur Rahman who refused to make a *causus belli* of the Panjdeh incident. After prolonged negotiations the line of demarcation between Afghan and Russian frontiers was settled by an agreement in 1887. The Russians retained Panjdeh and the Amir was given the Zulfikar Pass to which he had pressed his claim. Lord Dufferin strengthened the good will of the Amir by entertaining him at a *Durbar* at Rawalpindi. Friendly relation with the Amir.

Annexation of Upper Burma (1836)

In Afghanistan British policy was dictated by the fear of Russian advance, in Burma by the fear of French intrusion. The French were already in possession of Cochin-China and Tonkin and were trying to penetrate into Upper Burma. This was the real cause of the third Burmese War.

Lower Burma (Pegu) had already been conquered by the British (see p. 109) in 1852. They had also concluded trade agreements with the Burmese king by which they had been allowed to carry on trade with Upper Burma. But as a matter of fact the Burmese still refused to give any facilities to the British for trade within their country. This caused great irritation to the British merchants in Rangoon, who clamoured for the annexation of the Upper Burma. Their importunities, however, did not move the Indian government. But when King Thibaw began to court the friendship of France, the British Government scented danger. In 1883 Thibaw sent a mission to Paris which resulted in a new Franco-Burmese treaty in 1885. Negotiations were carried on for opening a French bank at Mandalay and for giving other commercial privileges to France. The British Govern-

**Thibaw fined
a British
Company.**

ment grew uneasy at the peaceful penetration of the French and were at last provoked into action by the indiscreet conduct of Thibaw. On some flimsy charges he imposed an enormous fine on the Bombay-Burma Trading Company and refused to reconsider his decision as demanded by the Government of India. Thereupon Lord Dufferin sent an ultimatum to Thibaw imposing certain terms including British control of Burmese foreign policy. These terms were rejected and so a British army invaded Upper Burma. It occupied Mandalay without meeting with any serious opposition. King Thibaw surrendered and was deported to India. Lord Dufferin then annexed Upper Burma by proclamation in 1886. The robber bands of Burma reinforced by disbanded soldiers and led by sundry pretenders, carried on a guerilla warfare which lasted for five years.

Burma like Afghanistan became a pawn in the imperialistic game of the European powers. As an independent monarch King Thibaw had every right to court French alliance. But the British would not allow the French to extend their influence over Upper Burma lest their possession of Lower Burma might be jeopardised. Hence they anticipated the French by forcibly occupying Upper Burma, quite regardless of the ethics of the transaction.

**Restoration
of Gwalior.**

**Tenancy
Acts.**

Internal affairs:—Lord Dufferin restored Gwalior to Sindhia, receiving suitable compensation. During his rule several Tenancy Acts were passed to safeguard the interest of tenants. The Bengal Tenancy Act of 1885 protected the tenants against unjust eviction and enhancement of rent. In Oudh the tenants were granted statutory holding for seven years with a right to compensation for improvement. In the Punjab the tenants were given a limited measure of protection against eviction and enhancement of rent by the Act of 1887.

A very important event during Dufferin's **National** administration was the meeting of the first *Indian National Congress* at Bombay in 1885. It was an unofficial body of men representing the advanced party of Indian reformers. Its object was to press for the introduction of democratic institutions into India. (See p. 158).

Lord Lansdowne (1888—94):—Lord Lansdowne who succeeded Lord Dufferin, had to devote a good deal of attention to the question of frontier defence. At first he estranged Abdur Rahman by the 'dictatorial' tone of his letters advising him upon his internal administration. This estrangement was further aggravated by the 'forward' policy which the Viceroy adopted towards the frontier tribes. Although the Amir could not effectively control these turbulent tribes, he resented British attempts to subdue them. Hence he felt uneasy at the British activity in Gilgit and Chitral, and the resulting strained relations brought Afghanistan and Britain to the verge of war. Fortunately the crisis passed away, and the appointment of a boundary Commission under Sir Mortimer Durand restored good relations on both side. (For details see p. 137.)

Lord Lansdowne had to deal drastically with some of the Indian States. In Manipur a disputed succession gave rise to troubles. The Commissioner of Assam who was deputed to settle the matter, was treacherously murdered by the Senapati or Commander-in-Chief of Manipur who had usurped the government. Thereupon Lansdowne sent an expedition. The Commander-in-Chief and his accomplices were hanged, and a boy Raja was placed on the throne under the guardianship of the Political Resident during his non-age. It should be noted that although there was great provocation, no annexation followed.

Another example of interference in the internal affairs of a dependent state was afforded by the

**Khan of
Khelat.**

case of Khan of Khelat. He was found guilty of murder and many acts of violence and so was forced to abdicate in favour of his son.

Kashmir.

The Maharaja of Kashmir was not pulling on well with the British Resident, Mr. Plowden. The latter was recalled by Lord Dufferin in 1888 for his vexatious interference in the internal affairs of the state. Next year Lord Lansdowne, acting on certain vague and unsubstantiated charges, compelled the Maharaja to surrender his throne and entrusted the administration of the country to a council of regency. This high-handed act caused a flutter in the House of Commons and the Maharaja was restored in 1905.

**Social
legislation.**

Factory Act.

Internal Affairs:—During Lord Lansdowne's viceroyalty several important measures of social and political reform were carried out. (a) The first was a *Factory Act* which amended and amplified Lord Ripon's Factory Act of 1881. The hours of employment for women were limited to eleven hours a day. The minimum age for children was raised from seven to nine, their hours of work restricted to seven hours, and night work was forbidden for them. Lastly, a weekly holiday was prescribed for all factory hands. (b) The Age of Consent Act raised the limit within which protection was given to young girls from ten to twelve years. This Act like Bentinck's abolition of the *Sati* provoked a great outcry amongst the orthodox section of the Hindus but Lord Lansdowne refused to swerve from his decision.

**Age of
Consent Act.**

**Exchange
question.**

Lord Lansdowne had to deal with a very serious currency problem on account of the depreciation in the value of the silver rupee and the consequent dislocation of the Indian finance. The Government closed the mints against the unrestricted coinage of silver and made gold a legal tender. The rate of exchange was fixed at fifteen rupees to a sovereign.

Indian Councils Act of 1892:—To meet the

demand for constitutional advance voiced by the new-born Congress, Lord Dufferin had suggested certain measures for the reorganisation of the Legislative Councils. Upon his suggestions was based Lord Cross's Indian Councils Act of 1892. It enlarged the Legislative Councils, both Imperial and Provincial, by increasing the number of additional members. In the Imperial Council the maximum number of members was raised to sixteen, and in the Provincial Councils to twenty in the major provinces and to fifteen in the minor ones. At the same time the proportion of non-official members was increased. A significant change was made in the mode of appointing the members. Although the principle of election was not directly conceded, rules were framed under the Act to provide for the nomination of non-official members by commercial, educational and territorial associations such as Chambers of Commerce, Universities, Municipalities, District Boards etc. In the Imperial Council four members were elected by the non-official members of the local councils. Thus the *representative*, though not the *elective*, principle was cautiously introduced. Along with these changes in the constitutions of the councils their functions were also enlarged. Previously the members of the Viceroy's Legislative Council had only the right to discuss financial matters when new taxation was imposed. Now the annual budget was to be laid before the Council and every member could criticise it. The right of interpellation, that is questioning the executive officers as to their administrative acts, was also granted under certain restrictions. It should be noted, however, that both in the Supreme and in the provincial legislatures the official majority was still retained. The Act indeed fell short of the demands of the Congress, but there is no doubt that it was an improvement upon the existing system. Henceforth the executive had to meet the criticism of the councils

*Indian
Councils
Act, 1892.*

*Beginning
of repre-
sentative
system.*

*New rights
granted to
the Councils.*

and could be influenced though not controlled by them.

Lord Elgin (1894—99):—The period covered by the administration of Lord Elgin, successor of Lord Lansdowne, was one of great difficulty. Owing to the fall in exchange the new Viceroy was from the beginning confronted with the prospect of a deficit budget. Next came the outbreak of famine, plague and harassing frontier wars. These were difficult problems to tackle and so the Government came in for a good deal of hostile criticism.

Fiscal policy.

Financial stringency compelled the Indian Government to revise its policy of free trade and to impose a duty of three and a half per cent on all imports. To safeguard the interest of Manchester a corresponding countervailing excise duty was levied on the products of Indian mills. This exasperated the Indian manufacturers.

Famine and plague.

In 1896 the country was visited by the two scourges of famine and Bubonic plague. The famine was one of the most severe on record. It affected an extensive area from Bengal to Bombay and extended to the United Provinces in the north and Madras in the south. It took a heavy toll of lives. The plague broke out in Bombay and caused so great a panic that a large section of population fled from the city. The stringent measures taken by the authorities to combat the spread of the disease in utter disregard of Indian sentiments led to some unfortunate incidents.

Reform of Military Administration

Reorganisation of the army.

The Mutiny was followed by a reorganisation of the army (see pp. 124, 131), but the military administration remained as before. In the old system each of the three Presidencies, Bengal, Bombay and Madras, maintained separate armies under separate commanders-in-chief. These armies were in the main locally recruited. This 'three-army' system became an anachronism after the

Mutiny when the whole of India was politically united under the British Crown. Hence an important reform of military administration was introduced by an Act which came into operation in 1895. By it the whole army in India was placed under a single Commander-in-Chief and under him four Lieutenant-Generals were to command the forces of four territorial units, *viz.*, those of Bengal, Bombay, Madras and the Punjab. Military administration.

A further change was made by Lord Kitchner in 1904 when the Indian military forces were organised into three army commands and nine divisions. This system facilitated speedy mobilisation of the army in time of war.

Troubles in North-West Frontier:—Lord Elgin had to deal with troubles arising from Russian claim to the whole of the Pamirs. As a consequence a new boundary agreement was concluded with Russia in 1895. By it the limits of Russian and British spheres of influence in the Pamirs beyond Kashmir were defined. This for a time ended the long-standing rivalry between Russia and Britain over their respective spheres of influence over Central Asia. Boundary agreement with Russia

Lord Elgin had next to deal with the turbulent tribes of the frontier. The activity of the Forward School during the administration of Lord Lansdowne had made the tribes suspicious of British design, and they looked with growing alarm upon the construction of roads and railways up to the limits of their territory. By the Durand Agreement of 1893 the British Government had established something like a formal protectorate over Chitral, a little hill state to the north-west of Kashmir. It was British interference in Chitral politics that led to widespread frontier risings in 1897 over the whole belt of tribal territory. The British Resident at Gilgit proceeded to Chitral to interfere in a disputed succession. His presence was resented by the Mohand chiefs who Serious risings of the frontier tribes.

Troubles in Chitral

**The Tirah
campaign.**

closely besieged him. The siege lasted for a month after which the Resident was rescued by a strong relieving force sent from Gilgit. The second campaign was in the Tirah valley south-west of Peshawar. It was directed against the Afridis who had attacked British garrisons and closed the Khyber Pass. Extensive military preparations had to be made to subdue the Afridis who inflicted severe losses upon the British army. The rising was, however, put down in 1898.

**Lord
Curzon's
policy.**

Lord Curzon reversed the forward policy, gradually withdrew British troops from the tribal territory, retaining only a few isolated posts and enrolled tribal levies for maintaining peace in the tribal area. For the better regulation of tribal affairs he separated the frontier districts from the Punjab and constituted them into a new province known as the North-West Frontier Province (*see below.*)

LORD CURZON (1899—1905)

**General
remarks.**

Lord Curzon, who succeeded Lord Elgin, was one of the ablest of the Governors-General sent out by England to govern India. "For good or ill no Governor-General since Dalhousie so deeply impressed his personal mark upon the whole framework of Indian administration." A man of masterful nature with exuberant energy he drove the wheels of the administration with impatient haste, quite regardless of popular feelings and susceptibilities. His autocratic temper and overweening self-confidence 'challenged criticism and invited enmities.' This at times led him into indiscreet utterances which inflamed popular passions and made him unpopular. He had a high sense of duty which he discharged with unremitting toil and he had a good record of achievements to his credit.

Foreign Policy:—External affairs claimed a good deal of Lord Curzon's attention. He had to

deal with the North-West Frontier tribes, Afghanistan, Persia and with Tibet. His foreign policy was on the whole successful and he did his best to safeguard British interests everywhere.

With regard to the settlement of tribal coun- Settlement
of the
tribal
problem on
the North-
West
Frontier.
try on the north-west Lord Curzon did not agree with the extreme advocates of the forward policy. He wanted to put a stop to the costly punitive expeditions which had been so frequent of late years. Hence he withdrew British troops from the advanced frontier posts and replaced them by levies raised from local tribesmen. Within the British side of the lines forces were strengthened and concentrated, and strategic railways were built up to Jamrud at the entrance to the Khyber Pass and Thal, the gate of the Kurram valley. His next measure was to create a new North-West Frontier Province consisting of trans-Indus districts of the Punjab and the political agencies of the Malakand, the Khyber, the Kurram etc. There is no doubt that Curzon's policy saved much money and had been accompanied by much less trouble and greater efficiency. But it did not finally solve the frontier problem. It broke down under the strain of general unrest caused by the Great War of 1914-18. (*See Topical Analysis B.*)

On the death of Abdur Rahman his son, Relations
with
Afghanistan
Habibullah, became the Amir of Afghanistan. Lord Curzon had some trouble with the new Amir over the question of the renewal of the treaty which his father had concluded with the British Government. The matter was, however, peacefully settled by Lord Amthill, the acting Viceroy during the Lord Curzon's leave, and cordial relations were re-established with Habibullah. (*For details see Topical Analysis B.*)

Great Britain had long been interested in the British
interests in
Persia and
safeguarded.
Persian Gulf for reasons both political and commercial. She jealously guarded its shores against the attempts of other European powers to obtain

territorial stations there. But the exclusive influence of Britain in the Persian Gulf was challenged by other powers like France, Russia and Turkey and so Lord Curzon had to take a strong line. He visited the Persian Gulf in 1903 and took effective measures to protect British interests and to repel the insidious attempts of other powers.

**Curzon's
Tibetan
policy.**

Lord Curzon's Tibetan policy was another aspect of the anti-Russian policy which Great Britain had all along followed in Asia. Tibet was nominally a Chinese dependency but was to all intents and purposes an independent country. The Tibetans had an intense aversion to foreigners and so they ignored the trade agreements which they had to make with the British Government in 1890 and 1893. About the time when Lord Curzon assumed office the Tibetans were eager to shake off Chinese sovereignty and were willing to welcome Russian friendship as a counterpoise. Their ruler, the Dalai Lama, fell under the influence of Dorjief, a Russian Buddhist, and through him entered into negotiations with the court of Russia. Although Dorjief's mission was of a religious character, the Indian government became uneasy and Lord Curzon believed that a secret treaty had been concluded between Tibet and Russia. He extorted a reluctant consent from the Home Government to his plan of sending a mission to Tibet. The mission was led by Colonel Younghusband who brushing aside the feeble resistance of the Tibetans, occupied Lhasa in 1904. The Tibetans were forced to sign a treaty by which they agreed to open trade marts and to pay an indemnity. The Home Government softened some of the harsh terms of the treaty. By the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907 Great Britain came to a definite understanding with Russia as to the policy they would pursue in regard to Tibet. *(For fuller details see Topical Analysis A. and p. 185)*

**Fear of
Russian
influence.**

Internal Administration:—Efficiency was Lord Curzon's watchword and to secure it he practically overhauled the whole machinery of administration. He was impatient of incompetency and delay and so did his best to infuse vigour into every department. He appointed committees to enquire into the defects and anomalies of the existing systems and promptly gave effect to their recommendations.

Lord Curzon gave a good deal of attention to the problem of land revenue and to the condition of the peasantry. He introduced greater elasticity both in the assessment and collection of the land revenue by arranging for the revision and reduction of assessment as the circumstances required. He laid down the salutary principle that the government demand should vary according to the character of the season. In cases where assessment has to be increased it should be done by graduated steps.

Land
revenue.

Measures
to benefit
cultivators.

He took several measures for improving the condition of the peasant. He started *Co-operative Credit Societies* to provide cultivators with necessary capital at a low rate of interest. This lessened the burden of their debts. He passed the *Punjab Land Alienation Act* to prevent the land of the cultivators from being transferred by sale or mortgage to the money-lending class. Lastly, he appointed an Inspector-General of Agriculture and founded an Imperial Agricultural Department to encourage the application of scientific methods to Indian agriculture.

Agricultural
Department.

In 1904, Lord Curzon passed the *Universities Act* in order to bring the Universities under the more strict control of the Government. This Act reorganised the constitution of the Syndicates, provided for the official inspection of the colleges and placed the final decision concerning the affiliation and disaffiliation of colleges in the hands of the Government of India. Steps were also taken to develop the Universities from examining to teaching bodies.

Official
control of
Universities.

**Preservation
of ancient
monuments.**

The measures adopted by Lord Curzon for the conservation and restoration of ancient monuments deserve unqualified praise. He passed an Act for the Preservation of Ancient Monuments and established the department of Archaeological Survey which has done much to preserve the relics of the past and to excavate the sites of antiquity. This has promoted the growth of historical research and archaeological study in India.

**Financial
measures.**

Lord Curzon set up a new department of Commerce and Industry and placed it under the charge of a sixth member of the Executive Council. Among his financial reforms the most important was the legislation which made gold a legal tender and fixed the rate of exchange at fifteen rupees to the sovereign. The Salt Tax was nearly halved and the limit of exemption from the Income Tax was raised to benefit the smaller incomes.

**Swadeshi
movement.**

Partition of Bengal:—Lord Curzon considered the province of Bengal too big and unwieldy to be effectually administered by one Lieutenant-Governor. So he partitioned Bengal and created a new province called 'Eastern Bengal and Assam' which he placed under a Lieutenant-Governor with his capital at Dacca. This measure provoked violent opposition from the people of Bengal, who looked upon it as an insidious attempt to undermine the influence of the Bengalees by splitting them up into two sections. A violent agitation spread all over the country and the popular leaders started the 'Swadeshi' movement which aimed at boycotting English goods. There was unrest throughout the country which eventually led to sporadic outbursts of anarchical crimes. (See p. 179).

**Relation
with the
Native
States.**

Lord Curzon showed too much readiness to interfere in the affairs of the Native States. He persuaded the Nizam to hand over Berar to the British Government under the fiction of a perpetual lease. He organised the Imperial Cadet

Corps to give military training to the sons of the ruling chiefs. He also compelled the Native Princes to maintain a contingent of troops at their own expense to enable them to help the Government in times of need.

Lord Curzon's Resignation:—The resignation of Lord Curzon was brought about by his disagreement with Lord Kitchener, the Commander-in-Chief, on the question of military administration. There was a Military Member in the Governor-General's executive council through whom the Government supervised the administration of the Indian army. This member was an army officer and was the constitutional adviser of the Viceroy in all military matters. The Commander-in-Chief was also an extraordinary member of the Viceroy's Council, but he had to submit all his schemes and proposals relating to the army through the Military Member who was an officer of lower rank than himself. This was an anomalous state of things. Hence Lord Kitchener proposed to abolish the office of the Military Member and to transfer the whole business of military administration to the charge of the Commander-in-Chief. Lord Curzon opposed this proposal on the ground that the concentration of all military authority in the hands of the Commander-in-Chief would involve the undue lowering of the civil authority. The Secretary of State supported Lord Kitchener and so Lord Curzon resigned. Thus a great change took place in the army administration. Henceforth the Commander-in-Chief became the sole adviser to the Government of India on military affairs.

Disagreement with Kitchener as regards army administration.

N.B.—It should be noted that Lord Kitchener's system proved disastrous during the Great War of 1914. "The concentration of executive and administrative power in the hands of one overworked Commander-in-Chief resulted in the breakdown of the transport and of the medical service in Mesopotamia during the war."—P. E. Roberts. The Commission of inquiry that followed condemned the Kitchener system and thereby vindicated Lord Curzon's views.

Curzon's point of view vindicated.

PROGRESS OF NATIONAL MOVEMENT

Growth of
discontent.

With the dawn of the twentieth century the national movement in India acquired new vigour and momentum. This was in part due to the indifference with which the prayers and petitions of the Congress was treated by the irresponsive bureaucracy. As Hume declared, "the National Congress had endeavoured to instruct the Government, but the Government had refused to be instructed." The educated community which till now had pinned their hopes on British liberalism, were seized with a sense of frustration and a section of them began to develop a new spirit of opposition to the Government. The leader of this section was *Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, a Chitpavan Brahman of Maharashtra. He was an erudite scholar and a true patriot. He stimulated the national spirit of the masses by organising annual festivals in honour of Ganesh, the elephant-headed god of wisdom and by reviving the cult of Sivaji, the founder of the Maratha *Swaraj*. Through the columns of his paper, *Kesari*, he fomented the unrest provoked by the high-handed measures taken by the Government to check the spread of bubonic plague in Bombay. As a consequence two Englishmen, Mr. Rand, the unpopular Plague Commissioner, and a military officer, were assassinated. Tilak was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment on a charge of sedition.

Activity
of Tilak.

Causes of
unrest.

of
national
events.

The spirit of unrest and discontent voiced by Tilak soon spread to different parts of the country. Many causes were at work to stimulate this spirit and to intensify the national agitation. First, the Indian unrest at the beginning of the twentieth century was part of a greater movement—the awakening of Asia. All over the East the ferment of western democratic ideas was rapidly spreading, and the rise of an educated intelligentsia in Persia, China and India fostered the instinct of Asiatic self-assertion against western domination. In all these countries there were significant movements

going on for liberation. The resounding victory of Japan over Russia reverberated throughout the East and thrilled it with new hope and ambition. Asia perceived the possibility of a renaissance which would secure her from exploitation and redeem her characteristic cultures from the stigma of inferiority. These broader currents of Asiatic sentiment considerably influenced the Indian nationalist movement.

Japan's
victory over
Russia.

Secondly, to this general cause were added others particularly connected with India. Much bad blood was created by the shabby treatment of Indians in the British colonies of South Africa. There the Indians were treated as *pariahs*.

Ill-treat-
ment of
Indians
abroad.

But what offended the people most was the autocratic rule of Lord Curzon, characterised by a cynical disregard of popular feelings. His official Secrets Bill was a reversal of all canons of civilised jurisprudence. His Universities Act aiming at the official control of higher education, his officialisation of the Calcutta Corporation and his strictures upon Indian character—all these outraged public feeling and provoked strongly-worded protests. Matters came to a head in 1905 when Lord Curzon partitioned Bengal on the plea of administrative convenience. It was a Machiavellian measure intended to break the solidarity of the Bengalee intelligentsia and to encourage Hindu-Muslim rift. Lord Curzon had fired a very big gun but the recoil was tremendous. A wave of indignation swept over the whole province and anti-partition meetings were organised in almost all towns. Under the leadership of Surendranath Banerjee a strong movement was started to put pressure on the British Government by boycotting British goods. The response of the people was speedy and spontaneous. It was the students who showed the greatest enthusiasm. They started the picketting of shops and made bonfires of foreign goods. The *Swadeshi* Movement as it was called became the symbol of resistance.

Curzon's
reactionary
rule.

Partition
of Bengal.

Boycott of
British
goods.

**Bande
Mataram.**

tance and fostered a spirit of self-help. The streets of towns and cities rang with the cries of *Bande Mataram*, the immortal hymn to Motherland composed by Bankim Chandra, one of the greatest writers whom Bengal has ever produced. This inspiring song became the *Marseillaise* which was to carry young Bengal to the storming of the British Bastille. To the Government it was like red rag to the bull. It issued a circular banning the recital of the song in the streets.

**Importance
of the
Swadeshi
Movement
in Bengal.**

The Swadeshi Movement started in Bengal was a major phenomenon in the history of India's struggle for freedom. Gokhale in his Presidential Address in a session of the Congress held at Benares in 1905 remarked. "The tremendous upheaval of popular feeling which has taken place in Bengal in consequence of the Partition, will constitute a landmark in the history of our national progress.....Bengal's heroic stand has astonished and gratified all India." The attempt of the Government to repress the movement stiffened the spirit of opposition and introduced into the Congress politics a new spirit of self-sufficiency. Its prominent spokesmen were Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Aravinda Ghosh and Lala Lajpat Rai. They were all nationalists to the core and came to be known as Extremists as opposed to the Moderates who till now dominated the Congress. They were dissatisfied with the old leadership and its policy of praying, petitioning and protesting. They questioned the utility of constitutional agitation and pointed out its futility by a reference to the Partition of Bengal. They wanted to force the hands of the Government and to extort concessions not by prayer but by action. In the Congress held at Benares in 1905 disagreements between the Extremists and Moderates were clearly apparent. Next year in the Calcutta session of the Congress the rift between the two sections became wider and an open rupture was averted by President Dadabhai Naoroji, "the grand old man," who

**Rise of
Extremist
leaders.**

conciliated the Extremists by declaring that the attainment of *Swaraj* or self-government was the goal of the Congress. The differences between the two parties came to a head at the Surat session of the Congress in 1907 where a heated dispute ended in a free fight. It was a sad episode in the history of the Congress. The overwhelming influence of the Moderates prevailed and the Extremists were left in the wilderness till the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.

Split in the
Congress at
Surat
—1907.

LORD MINTO (1905—1910)

Repression and Concession :—

Lord Curzon had sown the wind and his successor, Lord Minto, had to reap the whirlwind. The viceroyalty of Lord Minto synchronised with the advent to power in England of a strong Liberal and Radical government, some members of which were known to sympathise with Indian aspirations. Hence the hopes of the leaders of the Congress rose high. In Bengal the anti-partition agitation was carried on with renewed vigour and the boycott movement gathered fresh strength. The educated Indians expected much from the new Secretary of State, Lord Morley, whose liberal views were well-known. But Morley disappointed popular expectations by declaring that the Partition of Bengal was a "settled fact" and he would not interfere with it. The government of Lord Minto sought to crush the nationalist movement by strong repressive measures. Peaceful picketers were mercilessly beaten and public meetings were dispersed by force. The Provincial Conference held at Barisal in 1906 under the presidency of an eminent Muslim leader, Mr. A. Rasool, was dispersed by the police. The unprovoked assault on the delegates created a strong sense of indignation. The extremist press assumed a militant tone and the *Yugantar*, a popular daily, openly preached the gospel of revolution. The Government passed a series of penal laws gagging the press and put-

Repressive
measures
to suppress
national
agitation.

Deportation of Extremist leaders.

Rise of terrorism.

Both Lord Morley and Lord Minto were alive to the new spirit that was surging in India. Hence although they had sanctioned special legislation to meet the campaign of violence they were convinced of the necessity of a policy of conciliation. Lord Morley thought that the best way of weakening the extremists was to rally the moderate party by granting some liberal measures of reform. He recommended certain constitutional changes which came to be known as *Morley-Minto Reforms*. Thus the British Government committed itself to a "blended policy of repression and concessions" in order to cut the 'malignant growth' of revolutionary crimes. The repressive measures have been described above. The concession was embodied in the **Indian Councils Act of 1909**. It enlarged the Legislative Councils both Central and Provincial, extended their functions and for the first time legally recognised the principle of election. The number of additional members of the Central Legislative Council was raised from sixteen to a maximum of sixty, of whom not more than twenty-eight were to be officials. The Governor-General was empowered to nominate five non-official members who together with the twenty-eight official

Measure to win over the Moderates.

Indian Councils Act—1909.

Councils were enlarged.

Official majority at the Centre.

members formed a solid official bloc. Thus an official majority was retained at the centre. The other twenty-seven members were to be elected by a group system representing various classes and minorities such as land-holders, Chambers of Commerce, Universities, Sikhs and Muslims.

In the provincial Legislative Councils no official majority was maintained. The number of their members was enlarged to fifty in the major provinces and to thirty in minor ones. They were to be elected by groups of local bodies, land-holders, universities etc. Although there was no provision for official majority, a combination of official members and nominated non-official members might have a small majority over the elected members. It was only in Bengal that the elected members had a clear majority. Provincial Councils.

The Act conceded the Muslim demand for "separate electorates," that is, the elections to the seats reserved for the Muslims were to be made by Muslim voters only. No such concession was made to other minority communities. This measure, besides being invidious, introduced the principle of communal representation which is anti-democratic. Its object was to widen the gulf between the Hindus and Muslims. Separate electorates for Muslims.

Along with the size of the Councils their functions were also enlarged. The Act authorised them to discuss and pass resolutions on the Government's budget as also on all matters of public interest. The resolutions were to operate as recommendations to the Executive Government. Any resolution might be disallowed by the Head of the Government acting as the President of the Council without giving any reason. The net result was that the Executive could be influenced, but it could not be controlled. Function of the Councils enlarged.

The Morley-Minto Reforms were supplemented by the Secretary of State by appointing for the first time an Indian member to the Viceroy's

Appointment
of Indians
to Executive
councils for
the first
time.

Executive Council. This entry of an Indian into the citadel of the Government was no doubt a striking innovation. In Madras and Bombay the members of the Executive Councils were increased from two to four and the practice was begun of appointing Indians to those councils. Two Indians were also appointed to the India Council which advises the Secretary of State.

Criticism
of Morley-
Minto
Reforms.

The Morley-Minto Reforms were never intended to set up a parliamentary system in India. Lord Morley himself admitted it. "Responsibility is the savour of popular Government and that savour the Indian Councils wholly lack." It was in these words that the Montague-Chelmsford Report of 1918 condemned the Indian Councils Act of 1909. Besides, class representation accentuates the distinction between the different classes and thus prevents the fusion of their interests. It teaches men to think as partisans and not as citizens. Lastly, indirect election and communal representation do not encourage a sense of responsibility to the people generally. The moderates, specially Gokhale, hailed these reforms as a fairly liberal measure. They thought that it was an important step in the direction of making the Executive responsible to the legislature. But the Extremists regarded the reformed councils as no better than dignified debating clubs.

Foreign Affairs—Anglo-Russian Convention

During the viceroyalty of Lord Minto the most notable diplomatic achievement was the *Anglo-Russian Convention* of 1907, which settled by peaceful means all outstanding disputes between Great Britain and Russia with regard to Persia, Afghanistan and Tibet.

The Convention was designed in the first place to apply to Persian affairs. For a long time British statesmen have been agreed that Great Britain has special interest in the Persian Gulf and so

would not allow any European Power to obtain territorial station there. Lord Curzon took vigorous steps to prevent France and Russia from acquiring coaling stations on the shores of the Persian Gulf. To counteract similar attempts in future, Lord Lansdowne, the British Foreign Secretary, made in 1903 a very important declaration to the effect that Great Britain would regard the establishment of a naval base or of a fortified post in the Persian Gulf, by any foreign Power as an unfriendly act and as a grave menace to British interests. This declaration was rendered necessary by the fact that Persia was then in a state of internal confusion, and northern Persia was tending to pass under Russian control. But about this time both England and Russia were disturbed by Germany's imperialistic schemes in the East as manifested by the project of the Berlin-Bagdad Railway. So the two countries drew close together and arranged for a convention. By it both Great Britain and Russia agreed to respect the integrity and independence of Persia and declared that northern Persia fell within Russian sphere of influence while south-eastern Persia was demarcated as British sphere of influence. This convention averted a possible rupture between Russia and Great Britain at a time when Persia in the throes of revolution might have afforded opportunities for either side to intervene, had there been no previous understanding.

Agreement
between
Russia and
England as
regards
Persia.

The Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 was also of importance in regard to Afghanistan. Great Britain disclaimed any intention of altering the political position there, while Russia definitely acknowledged that Afghanistan lay outside her sphere of influence and agreed to send no agents into that country. Great Britain and Russia were to have equal commercial privileges there.

Anglo-
Russian
convention
with regard
to Afghanis-
tan.

The third region to which the Anglo-Russian Convention applied was Tibet. By it both the Powers agreed to respect the integrity of Tibet,

Tibet.

to abstain from interfering in its internal affairs, to send no emissaries to Lhasa and to treat with the Tibetan government only through the Chinese. Thus, Tibet was barred against the intrusion of any European Power.

Royal visit.

Capital transferred to Delhi and Partition of Bengal modified.

Lord Hardinge (1910-15):—Lord Minto was succeeded by Lord Hardinge. The new Viceroy's term of office is memorable for the visit of their Majesties, the King-Emperor George V and his consort at the close of 1911. His Majesty under the advice of responsible ministers made two important announcements, viz., (a) reversal of the Partition of Bengal and (b) the transference of the capital from Calcutta to Delhi. The Bengali-speaking people were reunited and the Province of Bengal was raised to a Presidency with a Governor in Council. Bihar, Orissa, and Chota Nagpur were formed into one province and placed under a Lieutenant-Governor in Council, while Assam was placed under a Chief Commissioner. To commemorate the royal visit an annual imperial grant of 50 lakhs of rupees for primary education was announced. Morley had described the partition of Bengal as a settled fact. It was, however, unsettled and the unity of Bengal restored. This was clearly a victory for the Indian national movement.

A bomb was thrown at the Viceroy on the occasion of his State entry to Delhi. The Viceroy was wounded and one of his attendants killed. The criminal escaped.

In 1914, broke out the Great European War. Indian troops were sent to almost every theatre of the war where they distinguished themselves by their conspicuous valour. The loyalty of the Indian princes and people was demonstrated by their contribution to the expenses of war in various ways.

Lord Chelmsford:—In 1916, Lord Chelmsford succeeded Lord Hardinge as the Viceroy of India.

There was acute distress everywhere on account of high price, and strikes and other disturbances were frequent. To combat seditious crimes the Government in 1919 passed the *Rowlatt Act* ^{Repressive measures.} ~~Rowlatt Act.~~ arming the Executive with special powers to deport individuals, to control the Press and to set up special tribunals for the trial of political offenders without juries. These repressive measures were highly unpopular and there was agitation all over the country for their repeal. Serious riots broke out in several places, especially in the Punjab, ^{Troubles in the Punjab.} where the Government proclaimed martial law and adopted a policy of stern repression. It culminated in the massacre of *Jallianwalla Bagh* at Amritsar where General Dyer disgraced himself by firing upon an unarmed mob which had assembled at a public meeting. About two thousand persons were wounded and killed by this senseless exhibition of military strength. This brutal tragedy sent a thrill of horror and indignation throughout the country and is one of the immediate causes of the *Non-co-operation Movement*. (See p 198).

Afghan War:—A fanatical party in Afghanistan murdered Amir Habibulla for maintaining neutrality in the Great War. On his death his young son, Amanulla Khan, became king. Incited by the Bolshevik agents of Russia as well as to please the war party, the new Amir invaded British territory but was beaten back. In the treaty that followed the subsidy to Afghanistan was discontinued and the Amir was given a free hand to regulate his foreign relations.

The Government of India Act, 1919:—The growing discontent of the people brought home to the British Government the necessity of making some concessions to their roused political consciousness. This was all the more necessary in view of the great services rendered by the Indians to the cause of the Allied Powers in the Great War. Moreover, the Government wanted to rally the ^{Declaration of British policy on Aug. 20, 1917.}

Montague
Chelmsford
Report.

Basic
principles
of the Act
of 1919.

moderate opinion as the recent repressive measures had driven many 'moderates' to the extremist camp. All these causes combined led Mr. E. S. Montague, the Secretary of State, to make a momentous declaration of British policy with regard to India on August 20, 1917. He enunciated two main principles, *viz.*, "the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration" and secondly, "the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." Mr. Montague visited India and in consultation with Lord Chelmsford published a report known as the Montague-Chelmsford Report. Its main recommendations were as follows : (a) A beginning of responsible government should be made in the Provinces, the Provincial Legislative Councils should be enlarged, and they should have the largest possible independence from outside control. (b) The Central Government should remain for the present responsible to the Secretary of State and Parliament. The Legislative Council at the centre should be enlarged and made more representative and should have greater opportunities for influencing the Government. (c) The devolution of powers from the centre should be extended and legalised.

Central and
Provincial
subjects.

The substance of these recommendations was embodied in the Government of India Act, 1919. The Act divided the functions of Government into Central subjects and Provincial subjects and thereby took a significant step in decentralising the authority of the Government. The Central subjects were—political and external affairs, defence, railways, posts and telegraphs, customs and tariffs, income-tax, public debt and all-India services. The important Provincial subjects were—Local Self-Government, education, sanitation and public health, public works and irrigation, famine relief,

agriculture, maintenance of law and order and administration of justice.

The Central Legislative Assembly was replaced by a bi-cameral system consisting of a Council of State and a Legislative Assembly. The former constituted the Upper Chamber consisting of not more than sixty members of whom thirty-four were to be elected. The Legislative Assembly formed the Lower Chamber and was to consist of 145 members of whom 105 were to be elected. The powers of the two chambers were co-ordinate but money bills and grants were to be submitted to the lower house. The budget was made votable by the Central Legislature with certain specific exceptions. The Viceroy was empowered to restore any grant rejected by the Legislature, provided that he should certify that such restoration is necessary for the safety, tranquillity and interests of India.

Central
Legislature,
bi-cameral
system.

The Provincial Government was thoroughly remodelled. The Executive was divided into two halves—the Reserved Department and the Transferred Department. The “Reserved subjects” were to be administered by the Governor with his Executive Council with no responsibility to the Legislature, the Governor being responsible only to the Central Government and Parliament. The “Transferred subjects” were placed in charge of the Governor acting with the Ministers selected by him from amongst the elected members of the Provincial legislature. Thus while the members of the Executive Council, who managed the “Reserved subjects” were not responsible to the legislature, the Ministers in the Provinces were responsible to it. This dual government in the Provincial Executive is known as *Dyarchy*. The Ministers had to serve two masters, the Governor and the Legislative Council. The Provinces were to have unicameral legislatures called Legislative Councils which were to have a clear majority of

Dyarchy in
Provincial
Government.

‘Reserved’
and ‘trans-
ferred’
subjects.

elected members. "Communal electorates" first set up in the case of Muslims in 1909 was extended to other groups like the Sikhs, Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christians. The provincial budget has in the main been made votable by the Legislative Council which could cut down or refuse any demand in respect of Transferred subjects. But if the demand related to Reserved subjects, and was rejected by the Council, the Governor could restore it by certifying the expenditure as essential for the discharge of his responsibility.

**Importance
of the Act.**

There is no doubt that the Government of India Act of 1919 was an important instalment of constitutional reform. It was more substantial and comprehensive than any attempted before. It introduced direct election, widened the franchise and at points "crossed the line between legislative and executive authority." For the first time Indian Ministers were appointed to take charge of certain departments of Provincial administration, not as official nominees but as the leaders of the elected majorities in their legislatures and responsible to them alone. This was responsible government although to a very limited extent. All these were no doubt significant concessions. Besides, the Act afforded valuable opportunity to the people for training in politics and in the art of government. But despite these commendable features the Act was defective in many respects. As Dr. A. B. Keith remarks "the executive remained wholly free from direct authority of the legislature." The Dyarchy or the double executive betrays a lack of confidence in the capacity of Indians to manage their own affairs and that was why only such subjects were transferred to their care as were politically unimportant. The system did not make for efficiency of administration. It gave ministers responsibility without power and the legislatures power without responsibility. Besides subjects vitally related to one another, were divided into 'reserved' and 'transferred' subjects

**Its
defects.**

Sir K. V. Reddy, ex-Minister of Madras, very pertinently observed, "I was Minister for Development without the Forests. I was the Minister for Agriculture minus Irrigation." Development of agriculture is impossible without irrigation, but the latter being a 'reserved' subject the Minister had no control over it. The 'Moderates' accepted the reforms as they regarded them as important steps in the direction of self-government. The nationalist party, however, rejected them as being "inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing."

It was on the issue of the Montford Reforms that the 'Moderates' and the 'Extremists' parted company for ever. The 'Moderates' held a separate conference in Bombay in 1918 under the Presidentship of Surendranath and constituted themselves as a separate body known as the *Indian National Liberal Federation*. Effect of the Montford Reforms on party politics.

Lord Reading (1921-26):—Before he succeeded Lord Chelmsford as the Viceroy of India, Lord Reading was the Lord Chief Justice of England. His period of viceroyalty was a very trying time for British statesmanship. Mahatma Gandhi had launched the Non-co-operation Movement and the whole country was seething with discontent. The visit of the Prince of Wales was boycotted. On occasions the people were swept off their feet and several untoward incidents followed like the Chauri Chaura massacre in the U. P., and serious riots in Madras and Bombay. Shocked at these unfortunate happenings Gandhiji suspended the mass movement. He was, however, sentenced to six years' imprisonment. Communal differences added to the difficulties of the situation. In Malabar the Moplas, a sect of Muslim fanatics of Arab descent, committed fearful atrocities on the Hindus. Similar outbreaks took place in the U. P., the Punjab, of which the most serious was in Kohat. His difficulties.

By imprisoning Gandhiji and by his other measures of repression Lord Reading became very Non-Co-operation Movement.

Gandhiji imprisoned.

Some
measures
of Lord
Reading.

unpopular. He further added to his unpopularity by increasing the salt tax despite the opposition of the Legislative Assembly. He had, however, some salutary measures to his credit. He repealed the Rowlatt Acts and abolished the duties on textiles manufactured in Indian mills. The King's Commissions were thrown open to the Indians and a few seats were reserved for them in the military college at Sandhurst. Steps were taken to create a Royal Indian Navy.

Lord Irwin.

The viceroyalty of Lord Irwin who succeeded Lord Reading in 1926 was a time of storm and stress. A detailed account of India's struggle for independence is given in the next chapter.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

India as affected by the First World War

India's con-
tribution to
war effort.

It is a remarkable fact that India in the course of her struggle for freedom never sought to create an opportunity out of England's extremity. When England became involved in the meshes of the First World War there was nothing like vigorous anti-British agitation. On the contrary, the British Government received remarkable co-operation from Indian leaders in the prosecution of the war. From the outset India made an impressive contribution in men, money and munitions to the war effort of the allied powers. Lord Hardinge equipped a splendid expeditionary force of 290,000 troops to be sent to France and Egypt. Besides this, Indian soldiers fought in Palestine and Mesopotamia and everywhere they covered themselves with glory. It was the brave sons of India, who stemmed the tide of the German advance at a critical moment during the early stage of the war, and thereby saved Paris whose fall seemed imminent. As regards contribution in money, the Central Legislature voted a large sum as a free gift to the British Treasury while the

Princes and wealthy Indians made generous gifts to the Government and war funds.

In view of the substantial help rendered by Indians during the war the British Government felt morally bound to do something to satisfy their political aspirations. Accordingly Mr. E. S. Montague, the Secretary of State, made in 1917 his historic announcement of British policy in regard to India. He declared that India was to have self-government in progressive stages. This declaration was followed by important constitutional changes embodied in the Government of India Act of 1919 (see p. 187—89). Secondly, the war exalted India's status in the eyes of the world by giving her a place in the councils of the Empire. Two Indian representatives, Sir S. P. Sinha of Bengal and Maharaja of Bikanir, took part in the Imperial War Conference in London in 1917 and afterwards in the international Peace Conference.

Effect of the war on India's political progress.

International status of India was raised.

Thirdly, the war intensified the Indian national movement which soon developed into the Non-co-operation Movement under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi. It also created irritation among the Muslims who started the Khilafat Movement as a protest against the British Government's post-war policy towards the defeated Turkish Empire. (See below.)

Impetus to national movement.

The war also produced an important change in the fiscal policy of the Government. The exigencies of war finance compelled the Government to increase the import duties on cotton goods without enhancing the countervailing duty on the product of Indian mills. This removed a long-standing grievance of the Indians. A Parliamentary Committee of 1919 recommended fiscal autonomy for India and this resulted in the establishment of an *Indian Tariff Board*. This Board adopted the policy of protection and imposed substantial duties on a number of British imports.

Economic results.

Policy of protection.

CHAPTER VI

National Struggle Since 1907

Attempt of Government to rally the Moderates and to prevent Hindu-Muslim unity.

For nine years after the Surat split the Congress was dominated by the Moderates. The British Government took advantage of the dissensions in the ranks of the Congress to widen the gulf between the parties and to drive a wedge between the Hindus and Muslims. The Morley-Minto Reforms were meant to rally the Moderates and to canalise the fast-flowing currents of Indian nationalism. They also mark a decisive stage in the British policy of using Indians against Indians. By conceding separate electorates to the Muslims these reforms strongly entrenched communalism and hit the national movement below the belt. Another sympathetic gesture to the Moderates was the reversal of the Partition of Bengal, a royal boon announced at the Durbur held at Delhi on the occasion of the visit of their Majesties King George V and Queen Mary. (See p. 186).

Morley-Minto Reforms were disappointing.

It was, however, not long before the people saw through the imperialistic game. They found the Reforms of 1909 unsatisfactory in their actual working. They had asked for bread and were given only stones. They found that the enlarged Legislative Councils only veiled autocracy behind an artificial majority. The substance of power was retained by the irresponsible executive while the form was conceded to the legislature. They realised the danger inherent in the separate electorates granted to the Muslims. Hence they became more and more estranged from the Government.

Irritation caused by the ill-treatment of Indians in South Africa.

About this time several new factors were at work to stir up national feeling and to consolidate the national movement. The attitude of the Union Government of South Africa to the Indian residents there, provoked the deepest indignation in India. It shocked Hindus and Muslims alike.

M. K. Gandhi took up the cause of the Indians and adopted the policy of passive resistance to the discriminating laws passed against them. So strong was the feeling aroused in India that even Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy, showed his sympathy for the passive resistance movement and condemned the Immigration Laws of South Africa as unjust and invidious. Events in South Africa convinced both Hindus and Muslims of the necessity of marking common cause against British imperialism. About this time a new generation of educated Muslims came to the front and secured control of the Muslim League. Their political outlook was broad and nationalist. Certain foreign factors changed their attitude towards the Congress and brought them close to it. They were greatly concerned over the fate of Turkey whose Sultan was the spiritual head of Islam. Turkey was threatened with dissolution by the revolt of her subject nationalities who were being backed by Russian help and British diplomacy. The Indian Muslims felt very uneasy over Turkey's plight and sent a medical mission to Turkey under Dr. Ansari. England's unsympathetic attitude towards their spiritual head annoyed them and undermined their loyalty to the British Government. The Muslim League led by nationalist leaders like Maulana Muhammad Ali, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and others declared at its annual session at Lucknow (1913) that henceforth the attainment of self-government would be its creed. This new move prepared the ground for co-operation with the Congress. At this time Mr. M. A. Jinnah took an important step towards Hindu-Muslim unity by persuading the Muslim League to hold its sessions simultaneously with those of the Congress at the same place. In 1916 both the Congress and the League held their session at Lucknow and bridged the gulf between the two communities. A joint scheme of reforms was adopted by the Congress and the League, and both the bodies came to an agreement as to the method of election to the

Gandhi in South Africa.

The Muslim League develops a nationalist outlook.

**The Congress-League
Pact at
Lucknow
—1916.**

Councils and the distribution of seats. This is known as the *Lucknow Pact of 1916* and its most important feature was that the Congress agreed to separate electorates for the Muslims, and the League accepted the Congress creed of *Swaraj* and agreed to press the joint scheme on the Government as a united national demand. The Hindu-Muslim rapprochement as effected by the Lucknow Pact was a significant development of Indian politics. It gave a bad headache to the Government. The rising tide of nationalism which carried the Hindu and Muslim leaders into the same camp was viewed with anxiety by the die-hard bureaucracy. But it should be noted that the Pact involved a surrender of the Congress principles. It accepted the British policy of dividing the two communities without giving much thought for future consequences.

**Home Rule
Leagues set
up by Annie
Besant and
Tilak.**

About this time the Moderates and Extremists composed their differences and two associations were founded for intensifying the national movement. These were the two Home Rule Leagues founded in 1916, one by Mrs. Annie Besant and the other by Tilak at Poona. They jointly carried on an intensive propaganda in favour of the Lucknow Pact. The British Government now in the throes of war efforts, realised the necessity of a new handling of the situation. Mr. E. S. Montague was outspoken in his criticism of the Indian government and declared that it "is too wooden, too iron, too inelastic, too anti-diluvian to be of any use for the modern purposes we have in view." When he became Secretary of State for India he announced a change of policy in his famous declaration of Aug. 20, 1917. Next came the Montague-Chelmsford Report followed by the Government of India Act of 1919. (See p. 188.) The same year Mahatma Gandhi joined the national movement and gave it a new turn.

Section I

NEW PHASE OF INDIA'S STRUGGLE

Advent of Gandhiji

The year 1919 was an important landmark in the history of India's struggle for freedom. It saw the entry of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi into the arena of Indian politics. With him came new technique and new orientation of spirit. He had already made a name by his successful agitation against the discriminating legislation passed against the Indians by the Government of General Smuts in South Africa. He had also tried his peculiar technique of action to relieve the distress of the peasantry of Champaran in Bihar and of Kheda in Gujrat. He was just the leader which the country needed when the Government was arming itself with extraordinary powers to check the rising tide of Indian nationalism. Behind the facade of Montford Reforms the Government entrenched itself by a series of repressive legislation embodied in the Rowlatt Act of 1919. It empowered the executive to deport individuals, to set up special tribunals, to control the press and to adopt other repressive measures. Gandhiji appealed to the Viceroy to withhold his consent to those obnoxious measures. When his appeal was ignored he came to the fore and started the passive resistance movement as a challenge to the Government. The people were called upon to disobey the new law by non-violent methods. This was a revolutionary departure from the noisy politics of futile protests and ineffective condemnations. *"It was the politics of action, not of talk."*

Gandhi
starts
passive
resistance
movement
against
the Rowlatt
Act of 1919.

Gandhiji's call to "*Satyagraha*" met with a tremendous response. It led to mass demonstrations, not always peaceful, and to strikes and riots in many parts of the country. The Punjab was soon aflame and there were disturbances in Delhi, Gurjanwala and Amritsar. The Government retaliated by firing and killing. Matters came to a

**Massacre at
Jalianwalla
Bagh.**

crisis in the massacre of Jalianwalla Bagh where the people assembled in a prohibited meeting were ruthlessly fired upon by the troops under General Dyer (13th April, 1919). This was the worst example of governmental barbarity. About 400 persons were killed and more than one thousand wounded and left uncared for on the spot. It was as a protest against this gruesome incident that Poet Rabindranath Tagore flung to the face of the Government his title of knighthood. Gandhiji's call to Satyagraha was sealed and sanctioned by the blood that was shed at Jalianwalla Bagh.

**Khilafat
movement.**

About this time there were stirrings among the Muslims also. Turkey had joined Germany and fought against England and her allies. She was defeated and compelled to submit to very harsh terms. Her empire was dismembered. The humiliations thus inflicted on the Sultan who was the spiritual head (Kaliph) of the Islamic world, shocked the religious sentiment of the Indian Muslims. They resented the anti-Islamic attitude of England and started the Khilafat movement under the leadership of the Ali brothers (Maulana Shaukat Ali and Muhammad Ali). Gandhiji also joined the movement and so for a time the Hindus and Muslims were united together in a common struggle for their political regeneration. Industrial workers also became restless and there were no less than 200 strikes in the first six months of 1920.

Non-co-operation Movement:—When Gandhiji joined the Indian politics he had faith in the professed goodwill of the British Government. But the Rowlatt Act and the Jalianwalla Bagh incident shattered that faith. Henceforth he would have nothing to do with what he called the 'Satanic Government.' In alliance with the Khilafat leaders he started the Non-co-operation Movement in order to bring the British administra-

tion to a standstill. Its programme, among other items, included the renunciation of all Government titles, the boycott of legislatures, law courts and Government schools and colleges. This policy was adopted by a session of the Congress held at Nagpur in 1920. The nation enthusiastically responded to the call of Gandhiji. Lawyers suspended their practice, the students in large numbers left schools and colleges and bonfires were made of English cloths. The Government of Lord Reading took severe measures to stop the movement but thousands of people instead of being cowed, courted imprisonment. Under Gandhiji's inspiration the jail lost its terror and became a place of pilgrimage for the fighters of freedom. Thus began the epic struggle for freedom of a disarmed people against the entrenched might of British imperialism.

Repressive measures.

Gandhiji had roused the people and had enjoined strict non-violence on them. But the masses had not yet been trained to his peculiar technique. Hence in the train of his movement there followed incidents which perturbed him. At Chauri Chaura in the Gorakhpur district an infuriated mob set fire to police buildings and 22 policemen including an inspector were burnt to death. Gandhiji was shocked and he called off the civil disobedience movement in 1922. He was, however, thrown into prison by Lord Reading.

Gandhiji calls off civil disobedience.

The suspension of the mass civil disobedience movement led a section of Congressmen to organise a new party known as the Swaraj Party. Its leader was Desbandhu Chittaranjan Das of Bengal and Pandit Matilal Nehru. This party decided on re-entering the councils with the avowed object of offering systematic obstruction to the Government so as to make the constitution of 1919 unworkable. The Swarajists obtained notable successes in Bengal and the Central Provinces and did much to discredit the Dyarchy. They kept

Swaraj Party.

alive the spirit of opposition at a time when there was lull in Gandhiji's political activity.

**Boycott of
the Simon
Commission.**

When **Lord Irwin** succeeded Lord Reading as the Viceroy of India in 1926 he found the political situation drifting from bad to worse. The people had found out the hollowness of the Montford reforms and were in a sullen mood. There were signs of unrest among workmen owing to the spread of communistic ideas. The British authorities realised the necessity of reviewing the whole situation and appointed a Statutory Commission in 1927 under the chairmanship of Sir John Simon to report on the working of the reforms of 1919. There was no Indian member in it and so this "all white" commission was boycotted by almost all the political parties in India. The Congress in its session at Madras in 1927 proclaimed that independence was the goal of India. An all-parties conference met at Delhi in 1928 to draft a new constitution, and their joint labours produced what came to be known as the Nehru Report after the name of Pandit Matilal Nehru. This report demanded "Dominion Status" for India. The Muslim League looked askance at this report and Mr. Jinnah parted company with the Congress. When the Congress held its annual session at Calcutta in 1928 there ensued a bitter controversy over the Nehru Report. Subhas Chandra Bose and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru brushed aside the idea of accepting Dominion Status and demanded complete independence. But under the moderating influence of Gandhiji the Congress agreed to accept the Dominion Status if it was granted before the end of 1929. It at the same time issued an ultimatum to the Government declaring that in case the Dominion Status was not granted within the date so fixed it would organise a campaign of non-violent non-co-operation and a no-tax campaign. Perceiving the trend of events Lord Irwin announced in 1929 that the attainment of Dominion Status was "the natural issue of India's constitu-

**The Nehru
Report.**

tional progress." He also declared that after the publication of the report of the Simon Commission a Round Table Conference would be held in London to draw up a new constitution for India. But the healing effect of this announcement was lost as the result of some comments made upon it in England. Congress became sceptic about Britain's intentions and so in the Lahore Session of the Congress in 1929 under the presidency of Jawahar Lal Nehru it was definitely declared that the attainment of complete independence was the objective which the Congress wanted to secure. It was also decided to boycott the Round Table Conference envisaged in the Viceroy's proclamation.

Complete independence declared to be the objective of the Congress —1929.

Civil Disobedience

Next year (April 6, 1930) Gandhiji began his campaign of civil disobedience. He set out on his historic march to Dandi with seventy-eight chosen followers to break the laws regarding the production of salt. This was a signal for a nation-wide mass movement. For the first time in the history of the country women were mobilised for national struggle and they marched shoulder to shoulder with men-folk. The repercussion of the movement thus started took various shapes such as strikes, boycott of British goods and the like. In the North-West Frontier the Pathans also adopted the policy of non-co-operation under the leadership of Abdul Gafur Khan. The Government took stringent measures to put down the movement. Gandhiji and about 60,000 persons were thrown into jails while the people outside were mercilessly beaten and fired upon.

Gandhi's march to Dandi.

It was when India was thus seething with discontent that the Round Table Conference held its first session in London in Nov. 1930. No representative of the Congress attended it. The British Prime Minister, however, pleaded for the goodwill of all sections of Indian people and

Round Table Conference.

Gandhi-Irwin Pact, 1931.

Repressive policy of Lord Willingdon.

Reign of Terror.

Communal award.

Gandhiji's fast.

announced that he would strive to secure such an amount of agreement as would enable the new constitution to be passed through British Parliament. Thereupon Gandhiji was unconditionally released and Lord Irwin came to an agreement with him known as the Gandhi-Irwin Pact (1931). By it the Congress agreed to call off the Civil Disobedience movement and to join the Round Table Conference while the Government in its turn withdrew the repressive ordinances and released the political prisoners. Gandhiji then attended the second session of the Round Table Conference as the sole representative of the Congress. With regard to the communal question he tried to accommodate the Muslims as far as possible but the intransigence of the Muslim members backed by the machination of the British Tories prevented an agreed settlement of the communal problem. Mahatma Gandhi returned to India empty-handed. He sought an interview with the Viceroy, **Lord Willingdon**, (1931—36) but his request was turned down. Thereupon the Congress decided to renew civil disobedience. The Government replied to this challenge by repressive measures of unexampled severity. Gandhiji was imprisoned and the Congress declared a proscribed organisation. The movement was sought to be nipped in the bud by the wholesale arrest of the Congressmen, by shooting and lathi-charges, collective fines on villagers and seizure of their lands and property. A veritable reign of terror began. Matters were complicated by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macdonald, who made his "communal award" in 1932. It accentuated the minority problem by giving representation to the so-called "Depressed Classes" with the object of creating divisions in the Hindu community. Gandhiji who was in prison undertook a "fast unto death" as a protest against the provision of a separate electorate for the scheduled caste Hindus. But a timely compromise made by Dr. Ambedkar, the leader of the Depressed Classes, saved the situation from growing worse.

Its outcome was the Poona Pact by which the number of seats reserved for the "Depressed Classes" was nearly doubled. These seats were to be filled up by a joint electorate out of the panel of names selected by the Depressed Classes. This arrangement hit hard the caste Hindus although it maintained the integrity of the Hindu community. Gandhiji broke his fast and nationalist India heaved a sigh of relief.

Poona pact.

The severe measures adopted by Lord Willingdon made the continuance of civil disobedience difficult, and by the middle of 1934 the movement subsided for a time. Meanwhile Parliament passed the *Government of India Act of 1935* providing for an all-India federation and provincial autonomy. (For details see below.) The scheme of federation never materialised owing to the opposition of the Congress and the Indian Princes. But Provincial Autonomy came into operation from April 1937. On the assurance of the provincial Governors that they would not ordinarily interfere with the work of the Ministers, the Congress decided to work the provincial part of the new constitution. In the elections that took place in 1937 the Congress swept the polls in the general constituencies. The Muslim League fared badly even in provinces predominantly Muslim. Congress Ministries were formed in seven out of the eleven provinces and coalition ministries were formed in Sind and Assam. It was only in Bengal and the Punjab that the League predominated.

Decline of Civil Disobedience movement.

The Congress decides to take office.

The result of the elections widened the rift between the Congress and the League. The phenomenal success of the Congress alarmed Mr. Jinnah. He expected that Congress-League coalition ministries would be formed in all the provinces. But the Congress refused to form coalitions unless the League ceased to function as a separate group, in other words unless the League merged itself in the Congress Party. To this proposal of the Congress the League refused to agree.

Rift between Congress and League.

Jinnah's
attack on
Congress
Ministries.

Mr. Jinnah openly declared, "Muslims can expect neither justice nor fairplay under Congress Government." The majority of Muslims accepted this view and began to rally round the League. Mr. Jinnah "suddenly acquired a new personal authority" and became the undisputed leader of his community. He now started a campaign of vilification against the Congress Ministries. He began to complain of the unfair treatment of the Muslims in the Congress provinces and to circulate stories of "atrocities," never substantiated, against the Congress governments. Impartial observers and high European officials have testified to the justice and efficiency of the Congress Governments. Mr. Jinnah, however, went on with his fulminations.

Split in the
Congress.

About this time there was a split in the Congress camp. The Rightists led by Rajaji and Vallabhbhai Patel were devoted followers of Gandhiji. They counselled patience and were not as yet prepared to organise the forces of national life for the overthrow of the British imperialism. The Leftists were led by Subhas Chandra Bose. He stood for a bold policy and thought that the time was ripe for an all-out national resistance against foreign rule. The two parties came to grips on the occasion of the election of the Congress President for the Tripuri Session of 1939. Subhas Chandra sought re-election for Presidentship but was opposed by the Rightists who at Gandhiji's instance set up Dr. Pattabhi as a rival candidate. Bose won the election but was forced out of office by the Right-wingers who prevented him from securing a favourable Working Committee. Subhas Chandra then formed a new group known as the Forward Bloc. This split discredited the "Old Guard" of the Congress. It was tragic that Bose who had succeeded in winning the confidence of his countrymen failed to win the confidence of "India's greatest man."

Forward
Bloc.

The Congress Ministries did good work in the

provinces but were not destined to function long. When the Second World War broke out in 1939 and England declared war against Nazi Germany, India was dragged into belligerency even without the formality of consulting the wishes of the Congress. With great chagrin the Working Committee of the Congress protested against this attitude and asked the British Government to declare clearly its war aims in regard to democracy in so far as India was concerned. A few days after, the Congress demanded that "India be declared an independent nation and present application should be given to this status to the largest possible extent." The British Government was neither explicit in its declaration of its war aims nor agreeable to the demand of the Congress. Thereupon the Congress Ministries in the provinces resigned in Nov. 1939. The Muslim League was jubilant. Mr. Jinnah heaved a sigh of relief and asked the Muslim League to observe a "day of deliverance." The resignation of the Congress Ministries was, perhaps, a serious tactical blunder. Throughout the war the Congress was out of power and the British Government had no alternative but to woo the Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah took full advantage of the situation.

Resignation
of Congress
Ministries.

The rapid success of Germany and the fall of France in the summer of 1940 caused perturbations in India. Gandhiji issued appeals to the people to remain quiet declaring "we do not seek our independence out of Britain's ruin." The Congress though out of office, offered to co-operate with the war efforts of the allies if a provisional National Government was set up at least at the centre. But the British Government would not yield. On the contrary the Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, in a statement published on the 8th August, 1940, made it clear that the British Government "could not contemplate the transfer of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of government whose authority was denied by large and powerful elements in India's national offer."

India and
the Second
World War.

Lord Lin-
lithgow's
offer.

"August offer" of 1940 rejected by Congress.

life." At the same time he held out the prospect of a representative constituent assembly after the war was over. This statement is known as the "August offer." It aggravated the communal tension. Henceforth the communal problem became an insuperable barrier to India's progress. The Congress rejected the offer and as a protest Gandhiji started the campaign of individual civil disobedience.

Jinnah's two-nation theory.

The capital which the British Government was making of the communal disharmony encouraged Mr. Jinnah. He began to ignore all other Muslim organisations like the Jamiat-ul-ulema and Ahrar and demanded that the Muslim League should be recognised as the only authoritative organisation of the Mussalmans in India. He declared that in India democracy based on majority rule would not be workable. To cap the climax he declared at the Lahore session of the Muslim League (March, 1940) that the Muslims were not a "minority" but a separate nation and that they must have their separate homeland with a separate state, that is, Pakistan. The two-nation theory thus propounded dashed to the ground all hopes of Hindu-Moslem unity. His ceaseless cry for Pakistan produced a peculiar psychosis among his followers and they were taught to believe that in an independent India the Muslims would be in the minority and so would lose the preference which they now enjoyed under the British rule. Hence "the partition of India is the only solution" declared Mr. Jinnah. To Mahatma Gandhi on the other hand, the communal question was not an "unbridgeable gulf" between the Congress and the Muslim League. "It was a domestic problem which would disappear if the British withdrew from India."

Menace of Japanese Invasion

Meanwhile the international situation had become extremely serious. Japan had declared war

against England and had obtained resounding victories. Japanese soldiers had captured Singapore and Rangoon and were about to knock at the eastern defences of India. A united war front against the Japanese menace was urgently needed, but it was a difficult task in view of the communal discord and Indian distrust of British sincerity. That distrust was recently intensified by Mr. Churchill's declaration that the Atlantic Charter was not applicable to India. Realising the seriousness of the situation the British Government sent Sir Stafford Cripps to India to resolve the Indian deadlock and to rally all the forces of Indian life against the Japanese menace. On arriving at Delhi in March 1942, Sir Stafford Cripps opened negotiations with the representatives of various Indian parties and put forward his proposals in a Draft Declaration. It provided that India was to have Dominion Status and a constitution-making body after the end of the war. In the meantime the British Government was to retain control of the defence of India "as part of their world war effort" with the co-operation of the Indian peoples. Cripps virtually repeated the August offer of 1940. His proposals were rejected by every single party or group, and Mahatma Gandhi characterised the pledge about the future settlement of the constitution as "a post-dated cheque on a bank that was obviously failing." The negotiations broke down and Sir Stafford left India.

Effect of
Japanese
menace.

The Cripps
Mission.

The August Movement, 1942

The failure of the Cripps Mission produced a feeling of frustration in the minds of the Indian people at a time when they were alarmed and excited at the rapid approach of the Japanese army at their gates. The Congress leaders felt that only "a people's war" could avert the Japanese menace, and in order to mobilise the full resources of the

**"Quit India"
Resolution
—Aug. 1942.**

*Spontaneous
revolt all
over India.*

people a complete transfer of power to Indian hands was necessary. Accordingly the Congress Working Committee met at Wardha in July 1942 and published a resolution asking the British Government to withdraw from India. This "Quit India" resolution was endorsed by the All-India Congress Committee which met at Bombay on 8th August, 1942. It also declared that should the British Government refuse to withdraw, a mass struggle on an all-India scale would be started under Gandhiji's leadership. The British Government replied to this challenge by immediately arresting Gandhi and the members of Congress Working Committee (9th Aug., 1942). All other Congress Committees were banned. The sudden removal of all the prominent leaders produced a terrible explosion of popular feelings. There were mass upheavals and disorders in almost every part of the country and these took a serious turn at Midnapur and the eastern districts of the United Provinces. Crowds gathered in cities and rural areas and attacked what seemed to them the symbols of British power such as police stations, post-offices, railways etc. The unarmed and leaderless mobs faced police and military firing on no less than 538 occasions. The Government put down the disturbances with exceptional ferocity. Gandhiji at the age of 73 undertook a fast for three weeks as a protest against Government atrocities. There was great anxiety felt all over the country. The Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, refused to listen to the widespread demand for Gandhiji's unconditional release and so the three Indian members of the Viceregal Executive Council resigned.

**Netaji
Bose.**

Besides internal disturbances the British Government had to face a serious external danger. While the August Movement was dying out, the battle of Indian freedom was going on in a different quarter and under different leadership. Subhas Chandra Bose, a most gallant fighter for

India's freedom, disappeared from his Calcutta house where he was interned and made his way to Germany (1941). Thence he went to Japan and finally reached Singapore. At the time of the Japanese conquest of Malay a large number of Indian soldiers in the British army had fallen into the hands of the Japanese. They were released and Netaji, as Mr. Bose was henceforth called, organised them into **Indian National Army** (*Azad Hind Fauj*). He also set up the Azad Hind Government (Govt. of Free India) at Singapore in 1943. Netaji's army marched up to the frontiers of India and even penetrated into the Indian territory. Eventually the army was compelled to surrender to the British for want of provisions. Netaji's daring move gave a very bad head-ache to the British Government and is much more significant than is usually recognised. The ease with which Indian soldiers, whose loyalty till now was unquestioned, transferred their allegiance to a national leader, must have convinced thoughtful Britishers that the Indian army was no longer a dependable prop of British imperialism.

*Subhas
Chandra
and the
I.N.A.*

Significance
of the I.N.A.

The Wavell plan:—In 1943 Lord Wavell succeeded Linlithgow as Viceroy. He had a very difficult situation to deal with. Bengal was in the grip of an appalling famine while the eastern frontier of India was black with clouds. The communal question had brought about a stalemate in the government. Lord Wavell released Gandhiji in 1944 and tried to resolve the deadlock by stressing the fundamental unity of India. "You cannot alter Geography" he said. But Mr. Jinnah remained unyielding. To the Congress demand of "Quit India" he added the slogan "Divide and Quit." Gandhiji met Jinnah with definite proposals for finding a common solution but Jinnah rejected them. The more Jinnah was wooed the more intransigent he became. Lord Wavell flew to London in 1945 in search of a solution. He came back with a plan of interim government pending

**The Simla
Conference
—1945.**

the preparation of a new constitution. The plan was that the Viceroy's Executive Council should be so reconstituted that all its members, except the Governor-General and the Commander-in-Chief, were to be Indians selected from amongst the leaders of Indian parties on the basis of numerical equality between the caste Hindus and the Muslims. Wavell called a conference at Simla to select the personnel of the Executive Council, but his selections were not accepted by Mr. Jinnah. So nothing came out of the Simla Conference.

The Last Phase of the Struggle

**The advent
of Labour
Party.**

In August 1945 Mr. Churchill, the arch imperialist, fell from power and the Labour Government headed by Mr. Atlee took office. It was an important factor which expedited the solution of Indian constitutional deadlock. Mr. Atlee took a realistic view of events in India and found that the demand for national independence had become irresistible. The trial of some of the officers of the Azad Hind Fauj produced a bitter feeling of resentment all over the country. More serious was the mutiny of the R.I.N. ratings in Bombay (1946). These happenings convinced Mr. Atlee of the necessity of taking early action, and he announced the despatch of a Cabinet Mission to discuss with Indian leaders as to the best way in which political power could be eventually transferred to Indian hands. The Mission was composed of Lord Pethick-Lawrence, Secretary of State, Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade and Mr. A. V. Alexander, First Lord of the Admiralty. The Mission held a series of conferences with the Congress and the Muslim League delegates but failed to find common ground between the two irreconcilable parties. As the leaders of the two parties agreed to differ the Cabinet Mission issued a statement on the 6th May, 1946, laying down the basic lines of the future political set-up of India. It recommended that there was to be a Union of India, embracing

**The Cabinet
Mission.**

British India and the Indian States. This Union, that is, the federal centre, should have exclusive control of Foreign affairs, Defence and communications. Provinces were to have complete autonomy and were to exercise all powers except those vested in the centre. The provinces of British India were to form three groups : Group A comprising the Hindu-majority provinces of Madras, Bombay, C.P., U.P., Bihar and Orissa, Group B comprising the Muslim-majority provinces of the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan and Sind ; Group C consisting of Bengal and Assam. Each group was to settle its own constitution, and representatives of all of them together with the representatives of such Indian States as would join the Union were to meet in a Constituent Assembly to draft a constitution for the Union. Any province could withdraw from any of the groups after the first general election under the new constitution. The entire set-up may, if thought necessary, be revised after ten years or periodically every ten years.

Constitutional plan of the Cabinet Mission.
(a) Federation.
(b) Provincial autonomy.

(c) Grouping of States.

(d) Constituent Assembly.

"For the administration of India during the period of constitution-making the Mission emphasised the immediate need of an *interim government* backed by the major political parties."

(e) Interim government.

The proposals of the Cabinet Delegation was an honest attempt at balancing Hindu and Muslim interests. They sought to effect a compromise between the Union of India and its division. Although the Delegation definitely rejected the Muslim claim for a separate Constituent Assembly and a separate State, it tacitly conceded the two-nation theory of the League by grouping the Provinces on communal lines. The Centre was to have narrow, enumerated powers. This was also a safeguard to the Muslim community. Apart from maintaining the unity of India the Cabinet Delegation virtually accepted the principles of the League.

The Muslim League accepted the proposals of

The Congress rejected the Cabinet Mission's plan, but accepted the proposal of a Constituent Assembly.

The League first accepted and then rejected the plan.

the Mission for it found that the foundation of Pakistan was inherent in them. The Congress rejected the proposal for an interim government but agreed to participate in the Constituent Assembly with a view to framing the constitution of a free India. The Muslim League pressed the Viceroy to form an interim government without the Congress members, but Lord Wavell refused to accede to this demand. He declared that he had made it quite clear in his statement of May 16 that the interim government was to be a government of all parties that had accepted the plan. At this the Muslim League became furious and reversed its decision to accept the Cabinet Mission's plan. At the same time it threatened "direct action."

"Direct action" by the League.

Matters came to a crisis when the elections to the Constituent Assembly, held in July 1946, resulted in the return of an overwhelming majority of Congress members. Mr. Jinnah was alarmed at what he called the "brute majority" of the Congress. He threw his vaunted constitutional methods to the winds and incited the Muslims to "direct action" to secure their rights. It should be noted that the League's 'direct action' was directed not against the British Government which enslaved the Indians but against the possible Hindu domination. The Muslims were asked to observe August 16 as the Direct Action Day. The mounting communal frenzy reached a white heat and there followed what has been fittingly described as the "Great Calcutta Killing." The Muslim League Government under the premiership of S. Suhrawardy played havoc with the civic life of the inhabitants of Calcutta. The "League-gangsterism" started with stabbings and brutal murders of which the Hindus were mostly the victims. But soon the Hindus began to retaliate with effect. The orgy of murder and arson continued for four days, resulting in the loss of 5000 lives, and 15,000 injured. It was a most shameful

"The Great Calcutta killing."

chapter in the annals of India. Neither the League Ministry in office, nor the English Governor and English Viceroy who are ultimately responsible for law and order, took adequate steps to check this lawlessness.

The killing in Calcutta was followed by similar happenings in Noakhali and Tipperah (East Bengal) where the Muslims formed an overwhelming majority of population. In those places communal excesses were marked by the most lamentable outrages which spared neither age nor sex. Violence begot violence. The Hindus of Bihar were swept off their feet by the accounts of atrocities committed on their kith and kin in Calcutta. They broke into terrible riots in several places, in which the Muslims were the principal sufferers. The Congress in Bihar, unlike the League Ministry in Bengal, took prompt steps to bring the situation under control.

Riots in
Bihar and
Noakhali.

While the communal frenzy was still at fever pitch Lord Wavell formed an interim government with Pandit Nehru as Vice-President (2nd Sept.). At first the League refused to join it but was eventually persuaded by the Viceroy to do so. Lord Wavell by admitting the League members into the Executive Council wanted to use them as a counterpoise to the Congress influence. Five League nominees entered into the interim government and began to play the part of the "King's Party," destroying all team-spirit by their disruptive technique. The absence of co-operation made the interim government 'bi-partisan rather than a real coalition.' Worse still, the League refused to join the Constituent Assembly and went so far as to declare that it was not a properly constituted body and its proceedings and decisions were invalid and *ultra vires*. The intransigent attitude of the Muslim League added to the complexity of the constitutional problem and rendered the political situation in India extremely critical.

Interim
Government.

**Atlee's announcement
—1947**

On 20th Feb., 1947, Mr. Atlee declared that the existing state of tension and uncertainty in India "is fraught with danger and could not be indefinitely prolonged." Hence he made the momentous announcement that it was the definite intention of His Majesty's Government to "effect the transfer of power to responsible Indian hands" by a date not later than June 1948." This declaration was followed by a series of League-fomented riots all over the Punjab. They were attended with a degree of ferocity and cruelty which pen shrinks from recording. Against the organised might of the Muslim police backed by the frenzied Muslim masses the Sikhs and Hindus had no chance. Some six million Hindu and Sikh refugees streamed out of the West Punjab leaving a tale of misery and slaughter unequalled in the history of the human race. These harrowing incidents led the Hindus and Sikhs to demand the partition of the Punjab and Bengal so that the Hindu-majority districts in those provinces might be separated from those where the Muslims had a majority.

**Atrocities in
the Punjab.**

**Hindu-Sikh
demand for
partition of
Bengal and
the Punjab**

**Mountbatten
plan.**

In March 1947 **Lord Mountbatten**, the last Viceroy of India, succeeded Lord Wavell. He came here commissioned to accelerate the pace of India's march to freedom. In his broadcast of 3rd June, 1947, he outlined the procedure to be followed for the transference of power into Indian hands under the prevailing circumstances. The existing Constituent Assembly was to continue and complete its work, but the constitution framed by it would not apply to those parts of the country which were unwilling to accept it. The Muslim-majority areas might convene, if they so desired, a separate Constituent Assembly of their own. In that case Bengal and the Punjab were to be partitioned if the members of their Legislative Assemblies, representing the Hindu-majority districts were in favour of partition. In the N. W. Frontier Provinces a referendum of the local

people was to decide whether it would join the contemplated Indian Union or the Pakistan. Sylhet was also to decide by a similar referendum whether it would remain in Assam or would be incorporated in the new province of East Bengal. A Boundary Commission was to be appointed to demarcate the Hindu and Muslim portions of Bengal and the Punjab. Lastly, it was announced that in the current session of the British Parliament legislation would be introduced for the transfer of power to India, whether united or divided, on the Dominion Status basis without prejudice to the final decision to be taken by the Indian Constituent Assemblies.

The Mountbatten plan definitely prescribed the partition of India. The Hindus and other nationalists deplored this vivisection. But practical considerations induced almost all Indian statesmen to consider the plan acceptable. The Congress accepted it with a heavy heart while the Muslim League was jubilant as the plan conceded its demand for Pakistan. In July 1947 the British Parliament passed the Indian Independence Act. According to its provisions two new dominions were set up, India and Pakistan, and their territories defined. August 15 was fixed as the date for the transfer of authority. Lord Mountbatten was chosen the first Governor-General of India while Mr. Jinnah became the first Governor-General of Pakistan.

**Divided
independ-**

**Indian In-
dependence
Act, 1947.**

**15th Aug.
1947, the
date of
transfer of
power.**

India is free again but she lost the unity which had ever been the cherished ideal of her poets, philosophers and statesmen. It was a heavy price which she had to pay for her internal dissensions.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

The Government of India Act of 1935

The Government of India Act which received the Royal Assent in August 1935 was the last and

Genesis of the Act.

the most bulky of the constitutional documents framed by the British Government to put India on the road to Dominion Status. It was the product of prolonged discussions carried on in the three Round Table Conferences of which the last was held in 1932. On the basis of these discussions the British Government published a White Paper in 1933 and submitted it to a Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament with Lord Linlithgow in the chair. The Committee sat for eighteen months and reported in favour of the proposals of the White Paper. Next a Bill embodying the recommendations of the Committee was introduced in Parliament and passed in 1935. The Bill thus enacted into law came to be known as the Government of India Act of 1935.

Features of the Act—

- (a) Federation.
- (b) Provincial Autonomy.

The Act was based upon two principles : it provided for an all-India federation composed of British Indian provinces and of those Princely (Indian) States which would voluntarily join it. Secondly, it provided for Provincial Autonomy based on the principle of popular responsible government. It abolished Dyarchy in the Province but introduced it at the Centre. It retained communal representation which was first introduced in 1909, and extended the "safeguards" and special responsibilities devised in the Act of 1919.

- (c) Creation of new provinces of Sind and Orissa.

- (d) Separation of Burma.

Certain administrative changes involving territorial redistribution were made. Two new Provinces were created, *viz.*, Sind, which was separated from the Bombay Presidency, and Orissa, which was carved out from the old Province of Bihar and Orissa and enlarged by the addition of the adjacent portions of Madras and Central Provinces. These two, together with the North-West Frontier Province, formed Governor's provinces, making eleven in all. Burma was separated from India and a separate constitution enacted for it.

Besides the Governor's provinces there were

others administered by the Governor-General through a Chief Commissioner. These were Delhi, Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg, the Andamans and British Baluchistan. Chief Commissioner-ships.

Federal Part of the Act

The Federal Executive was to be composed of the Governor-General and a Council of Ministers. It was divided into two departments, the Reserved and the Transferred. The Reserved subjects were defence, foreign affairs, ecclesiastical affairs and the administration of tribal areas. These were to be administered by the Governor-General with the help of Counsellors whose number was not to exceed three. They were to be appointed by the Governor-General and were to be responsible to him alone. The Transferred Department was to be administered by the Governor-General on the advice of Ministers not more than ten in number. They were to be appointed by the Governor-General normally from among the members of the Legislature to which they were to be responsible. Thus the Executive consisted of two kinds of members, viz., the Counsellors responsible only to the Governor-General, and Ministers responsible to the Legislature. The result was that at the Centre Dyarchy was introduced, though such a hybrid system was condemned by the Simon Commission. Even in those subjects left in the charge of responsible Ministers the Governor-General had 'special responsibility' in certain matters such as the prevention of grave menace to the peace and tranquillity, protection of the rights of the minorities, etc. Thus the power given to the Ministers was hedged in with safeguards and restrictions. Federal Executive.

Reserved subjects and Transferred subjects.

Dyarchy at the Centre.

The Act set up a bicameral Federal Legislature consisting of two Houses. The Upper House, known as the Council of State, was to consist of 156 members for British India and not more than 104 members for the States. The members from the States were to be nominated by the Rulers. Federal Legislature.

Council
of State.

House of
Assembly.

The representatives of British India were to be directly elected on a population basis. The Council of State was to be a permanent body, one-third of the members retiring every year. The Lower House, known as the House of Assembly or the Federal Assembly, was to consist of 250 representatives of British India and up to 125 members from the States. The representatives of British India were to be elected not directly by the people but indirectly by the provincial legislatures. The members from the States were to be nominated by their rulers. Communal representation was provided for not merely in the case of Muslims, but also for the Sikhs, Anglo-Indians and Indian Christians. The normal life of the Assembly was to be five years but it could be cut short by the Governor-General.

Provincial Part of the Act

Provincial
Autonomy
subject to
certain
safeguards.

The Act of 1935 introduced important changes in the government of the Provinces. Dyarchy was abolished and a large measure of responsible government was established in almost every sphere of administration. Subject to certain safeguards the Act gave a separate legal personality to the Provinces and liberated them from the "superintendence, direction and control" of the Central Government. Thus the process of Provincial Autonomy which had its beginning in the past in several measures of decentralisation now reached maturity. Now the Premiers of Provinces became effective heads of provincial administration and Governors were instructed to act on their advice excepting in those matters in which they had "special responsibilities."

Provincial
Executive.

The executive government of the Provinces was vested in the Governor. He was to be aided and advised by a Council of Ministers chosen by him normally from amongst the members of the local legislature and responsible to it. The Governor,

like the Governor-General, was invested with certain extraordinary powers. He had 'special responsibility' in regard to certain subjects such as the prevention of a grave menace to the peace or tranquillity of the Province, the safeguarding of the rights of the minorities, etc. In such cases he was to act in his individual judgment. Besides, he could issue ordinances in times of emergency and these would have the force of law for a fixed period. In case of a breakdown of the machinery of the constitution the Governor was empowered to assume control of the whole administration by proclamation for a period of six months. These safeguards, that is, the special powers of the Governor, were no doubt serious limitations on Provincial Autonomy.

Special powers of the Governor.

The composition of the Provincial Legislature varied from Province to Province. In six Provinces, *viz.*, Bengal, Bihar, Assam, the United Provinces, Bombay and Madras, bicameral legislatures were established. The Lower Chamber was known as the Legislative Assembly and the Upper Chamber the Legislative Council. There was no Upper Chamber in the remaining five Provinces. The representation in the legislatures was arranged on the basis of the 'Communal Award' as modified by the Poona Pact. The franchise was extended to include about 30 million voters in British India.

Provincial Legislature.

A Federal Court was to be set up to decide disputes between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments.

Federal Court

The historic India Council (Council of the Secretary of State) was abolished. Henceforth the Secretary of State was to be aided by a body of Advisers who were to be paid by the British Parliament. In the Act of 1935 there was no mention of the Secretary of State's power of superintendence, direction and control.

Abolition of the India Council.

Criticism.**It fell short
of Dominion
Status.**

The Government of India Act of 1935 was declared unsatisfactory by almost all the political parties in India. The Congress condemned it outright and Pandit Nehru characterised it as "a new charter of slavery." The Muslim League headed by Mr. Jinnah, condemned the Federal part of the Act but declared that the scheme of Provincial Autonomy was to be 'utilised for what it was worth.' The fact was that the roused political aspiration of the people resented the checks and restrictions by which the Act sought to safeguard British supremacy. The Act was no doubt an important step towards Dominion Status; but it fell far short of it. Bristling as it did with safeguards and restrictions, and with Dyarchy at the centre, the Act was looked upon by the nationalists as a serious impediment to the attainment of Dominion Status, not to speak of independence.

CONSTITUTION OF FREE INDIA

The Indian Independence Act of 1947 which recognised the independence of India and divided her into two Dominions, allowed full liberty to the Constituent Assembly of each Dominion to frame and adopt any constitution without reference to the British Parliament. Accordingly the Constituent Assembly which first met in 1946, re-assembled in 1947 and finished its work on the 26th November, 1949. It declared India or Bharat to be a Sovereign Democratic Republic.

**Three
categories
of States.**

The constitution adopted by the Constituent Assembly has made India a Union of States. These States are twenty-seven in number and have been divided into three categories called Part A, Part B and Part C States. The territories comprising the Andaman and Nicobar islands are included in Part D.

**Part A
of States.**

The Part A States are the Governors' Provinces of British India. They are politically advanced and as such they have been given the full

measure of autonomy as defined in the Constitution. They are nine in number—Madras, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh (the old Province of C. P. and Berar), Bihar, Orissa, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, West Bengal and the Punjab.

The Part B States are those which were formerly ruled by the Indian Princes. They are allowed to retain their identity either individually or in groups. They are eight in number, *viz.*, Hyderabad, Jammu and Kashmir, Madhya Bharat, Mysore, Pepsu (Patiala and the East Punjab States), Rajasthan, Saurashtra, and Travancore-Cochin. The Governor of these States are called the Ruler or *Rajpramukh*. As these States lack a well-developed administrative system they have been placed for a period of ten years under the general control of the President whose directions they are to carry out.

The ten States in Part C are Delhi, Ajmer, Bilaspur, Bhopal, Coorg, Himachal Pradesh, Kutch, Manipur, Tripura and Vindhya Pradesh. These States are administered by the Central Government, that is, by the President acting to such extent as he thinks fit through a Chief Commissioner or through the Government of a neighbouring State. Their status is thus different from that of other two categories of States.

Fundamental Rights

Borrowing the American and French usages the Indian Constitution has set forth a number of Fundamental Rights to which every citizen of India is entitled. They are meant to afford protection to the people against the high-handed action of the Executive and Legislature. But the guarantee of these rights has been made subservient to the paramount need for the security of the State. There is, however, a unique feature in the list of the Fundamental Rights. It provides not merely for political or legal equality but for social equality as well. The constitution

prohibits all sorts of discrimination based upon religion, caste, sex and race. It has banned untouchability. In these respects our constitution is more enlightened than that of many other democratic countries where racial discrimination is maintained to this day. The Fundamental Rights have been classified in the constitution under seven heads, *viz.*, (1) Right to equality, (2) Right to freedom including freedom of speech and expression, peaceful assembly, movement to hold and acquire property etc., (3) Right against exploitation, (4) Right to freedom of religion, (5) Cultural and educational rights, (6) Right to property and (7) Right to constitutional remedies.

How the
Rights are
enforced.

These rights are not mere abstract declarations of principles but are enforceable in a court of law. The courts have been empowered to declare void any act of the Executive or Legislature, which takes away or abridges any of the Fundamental Rights. Besides, the judiciary has been armed with power to issue writs such as those of habeas corpus, mandamus etc. in order that it may enforce any particular right against any authority in the State, at the instance of the individual whose right has been violated. The constitution has given the power to issue these writs to the Supreme Court and the High Courts. Parliament is authorised to grant similar power to other courts as well.

Chief Features of the Constitution

Combination
of federal
and unitary
systems.

The structure of the government as set up by the Constitution of India is federal. The executive and legislative powers have been divided between the Union and the component units called the States. The Federation is of the closer rather than the looser type. The framers of the Constitution have taken special care to graft upon the federal system the strength of a unitary government in order to arrest centrifugal

forces. Although a dual polity has been set up the constitution has provided for a single judiciary, a single set of rights and obligations, single citizenship, all-India services and other factors which make for centralisation. Under certain conditions the Union Parliament can legislate on subjects included in the State list, and the President by declaring a state of emergency in any State can take over its administration. Thus the constitution has effected a unique combination of federal and unitary systems.

Another feature of the constitution is that it is the lengthiest and the most detailed constitution even penned. It contains as many as 395 Articles and 8 schedules. Its bulkiness is due partly to the incorporation of the accumulated experience gathered from the working of most of the constitutions prevalent in other countries, and partly to the inclusion of administrative details not usually found in other constitutions. Lastly, it should be noted that although it is a rigid or written constitution, provision has been made to impart to it a certain amount of flexibility. It is not so rigid as the constitution of the United States. A special procedure has indeed been prescribed for the amendment of federal clauses. But many of the provisions of the constitution can be amended or modified by the usual process of ordinary majority required for general legislation.

Machinery of Government

A. The Union Government:—The Executive of the Union consists of the President and a Council of Ministers. The President, elected for a term of five years, is the executive head of the Union. He shall appoint a Council of Ministers on the recommendation of the Prime Minister to aid and advise him in the exercise of his functions. The Prime Minister is also to be appointed by him. All the Ministers are jointly responsible to

Lengthy
and detailed
constitution.

Partly
rigid and
partly
flexible.

The
Executive,

President
and a
Council of
Ministers.

the House of People which is the lower house of the Union Parliament. If the President violates the constitution he shall be liable to removal by the process of impeachment.

Vice-President.

The constitution also provides for a vice-President who will ordinarily preside over the Council of States which is the Upper Chamber of the Union Parliament. He will act as the President during the temporary vacancy in the office of the President.

Blend of Parliamentary and Presidential systems.

Note :—The constitution has set up a Parliamentary type of government with ministerial responsibility. But the President has the power of dismissing individual Ministers. Thus in the government there is a blend of Parliamentary and Presidential systems.

Bicameral legislature consisting of the House of the People and Council of States.

Union Legislature:—The supreme legislative power is vested in the Union Parliament. It consists of the President and two chambers—the House of the People and the Council of States. The House of the People is to be directly elected by the entire population of the Union on the basis of universal adult franchise. It is to consist of not more than 500 members and its normal life has been fixed at five years. The Council of States is to consist of not more than 250 members of whom twelve shall be nominated by the President, and the rest shall be chosen by the method of indirect election on the basis of population. They are to be elected by the elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of different States and as such they are the representatives of the States. Money Bills and other financial Bills must originate in the House of the People and after they have been passed, they are to be transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations. These Bills shall be deemed to have been duly passed even if the House of People rejects the recommendations of the Council of States. In other words, the House of the People has sole control over Money Bills. In all other matters the two Houses have almost equal powers.

Money Bills.

In this connection it should be noted that although the Council of States reflects the federal character of the Union, its composition deviates from the acknowledged principles of federalism. In America equal representation is given to all the federating units (States) in the second chamber, irrespective of their size and population. In India the Second Chamber, *i.e.*, the Council of States, has been constituted roughly on a population basis.

The Supreme Court:—The Indian Constitution has set up a Supreme Court of India which besides being the highest judicial court, plays an important role in the government of the country. It consists of the Chief Justice of India and not more than seven other judges. It is at once the interpreter and guardian of the constitution, and a tribunal for the settlement of inter-state disputes as also of disputes between the Government of India and the States. Its jurisdiction is three-fold—Original, Appellate and Advisory. It may declare invalid any law of the Union or State legislatures if such law contravenes any provision of the constitution or exceeds the legislative power which the constitution has conferred upon the legislatures concerned. The judges are appointed by the President in consultation with the Ministers and other persons qualified to give opinions. The Constitution has sought to secure the independence of the judges by making it difficult for the President to remove them. It declares that the judges shall not be removed by the President, except on a joint address by both Houses of Parliament, on grounds of proved misbehaviour or other incapacities.

B. Government of the States:—The machinery of government set up for the States is modelled on the system established for the Union. The executive head of the States in Part A is the Governor appointed by the President for five years and holding office at his pleasure. Like the

- Governor.** President he is to be aided and advised by a Council of Ministers. The Governor appoints the Chief Minister on his own initiative, and the other Ministers on the recommendation of the Chief Minister. All the Ministers are collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly of the State.
- Rajpramukh.** In the case of the States in Part B the executive head is called 'Rajpramukh' who is subject to the control of the President and is to act with the advice of his Council of Ministers.

The Legislature of the States. In some of the States, *viz.*, Bihar, Bombay, Madras, the Punjab, the Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal, the Legislature is bicameral, consisting of the Governor and two chambers—the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Council. The Legislative Assembly is a popular body directly elected by universal adult franchise. The Legislative Council or the upper chamber consists of members indirectly elected as also of members nominated by the Governor. The Legislative Assembly once elected will normally last for five years, while the Legislative Council is in a sense a permanent body not subject to dissolution. One-third of its members shall retire at the end of every second year. The Legislative Assembly is presided over by a Speaker who is elected by the Assembly from among its members. In the Legislative Council the President is the Chairman elected by it.

The Lower House, that is, the Legislative Assembly, has full control over the Provincial finance. All Money Bills originate and are passed by it even if the Upper House does not agree. All other Bills may originate in either House and consent of both the Houses is necessary before they become law. A Bill passed by the Lower House but rejected by the Upper, may become law if it is passed for the second time by the Lower House even if the other chamber opposes it. Thus the Upper House can delay but cannot prevent the enactment of a Bill passed by the Lower House.

Relation between the Union and the States

The Indian Constitution has made a threefold distribution of legislative powers between the Union and the States, *viz.*, the Union List, the State List and the Concurrent List.

The Union List contains 97 items or subjects over which the Union Parliament has exclusive powers of legislation. These are subjects which affect the interest of the whole country such as Defence, Foreign Affairs, Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, Currency and Coinage, Union duties and taxes. Uniformity of legislation is necessary in these subjects.

The State List includes 66 items or entries over which the State legislatures have exclusive power of legislation. These are usually subjects in which diversity of local conditions may demand diversity of laws. Subjects like agriculture, public health and sanitation, education, maintenance of law and order, forests and fisheries have been placed in the State List.

In the Concurrent List have been put subjects in which both the Union and the States are interested and so the Union Parliament as well as the State legislatures can make laws in regard to them. The Concurrent List includes subjects like Marriage, Contract, Criminal law, Civil procedure, Labour Welfare, Social and Economic planning etc.

In case of overlapping and a conflict between the Union Law and the State Law regarding the Concurrent List, the former will override the latter.

Provincial Autonomy is a corollary to the federal system and so the States enjoy a large measure of self-government. But the constitution has put certain restrictions upon the autonomy of the States. The Union Parliament can, under certain specified circumstances, pass laws in respect of subjects enumerated in the State list. Thus it can make laws on any item in the State list if the

**Restrictions
on the
autonomy
of the
States.**

Council of States declares by a resolution of two-thirds of members present and voting that such a course of action is necessary in the *national interest*. Similar power is entrusted to the Union Parliament while a Proclamation of Emergency made by the President is in operation.

Besides legislative power the Union is invested with the executive authority over the States in certain cases. The Union Executive has the power to give directions to the State Executive to ensure compliance with the laws made by Parliament and the existing laws applying to the State. It also can give directions to the State Executive not to exercise its authority in a manner which may prejudice or impede the exercise of the executive power of the Union. There is no doubt that these are very wide powers given to the Union.

**How the
President
is elected.**

The President—His Position and Powers

The President of India is the head of the State. He is elected for a term of five years by an electoral college consisting of (a) the elected members of both Houses of Parliament and (b) the elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of the States. The election is thus indirect. It is required to be held in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote by secret ballot. The voting strength is shared equally between the elected members of Parliament on the one hand and the elected members of all the State Assemblies put together on the other.

**Powers of
the
President.**

The Constitution has vested the executive powers of the Union in the President. These powers are to be exercised by him either directly or through officers subordinate to him, in accordance with the constitution. The President being the head of the Union, all executive action of the Union must be expressed to be taken in the name

of the President. His administrative power includes the power of appointing some of the high dignitaries of the State, such as the Prime Minister and other Ministers of the Union, Governors of States, Attorney-General, the Chief Justice and other Judges of the Supreme Court, Judges of the High Courts of States etc. He can dismiss the Ministers individually as also any Governor of the State. The President has wide diplomatic powers. He negotiates treaties and agreements with other countries, subject to their ratification by Parliament. He gives credentails to Indian representatives to other countries. Ambassadors of foreign states are accredited to him.

Executive powers.

The President has also important powers with regard to the Legislature and legislation. He is a component part of the Union Parliament. He may summon, prorogue and dissolve the House of the People on the advice of the Prime Minister. He has the right to address either House of Parliament or both Houses assembled together, and for that purpose has the right to require the attendance of members. He has the right to send messages to either House of Parliament in regard to any Bill then pending in Parliament or any other matter, and the House must consider the message "with all convenient despatch." A Bill passed by Parliament cannot become law without the assent of the President. When a Bill is presented to the President after it has been passed by both the Houses, he may assent to it or withhold his assent. He may also, except in the case of Money Bills, return the Bill to the Houses for reconsideration with or without any message suggesting amendments. If the Bill is again passed by Parliament with or without amendment the President must not withhold his assent to it. When Parliament is not in session the President has the power of promulgating ordinances if he considers it necessary to do so.

Legislative powers.

His power to legislate by ordinances.

The judicial powers of the President relates

**Judicial
power.**

to the power given to him of granting pardons, reprieves, remissions, respites and of commuting sentences in case of any person convicted of an offence. This power extends to all cases where a sentence of death has been passed or where the punishment is by a Court Martial.

**Emergency
powers of
the
President.**

Lastly, the constitution has vested in the President certain extraordinary powers to deal with cases of emergency. He may issue a "Proclamation of Emergency" when (a) the security of India or any part thereof is threatened by war, external aggression or internal disturbance ; (b) when the constitutional machinery of a State breaks down so that its government cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution ; and (c) when a situation arises, which threatens the financial stability or credit of India or any part thereof. In the first case the Union assumes wider control of the States or any of them, and may suspend the enforcement of the fundamental rights granted by the Constitution. In the second case the government of the State concerned is superseded by the Union. It is for the time being centrally administered. In the third case the object of the Proclamation is to maintain the financial stability of India by controlling the expenditure of the States by reducing the salaries of the public servants and by enforcing such other economies as may be necessary. Generally speaking, the effect of the Proclamation of Emergency is to turn the federal constitution into a unitary one. For while the Proclamation is in operation the Union Parliament shall have unrestricted power to legislate for the whole of India or any part thereof in respect of any of the matters enumerated in the State list. Secondly, the executive power of the Union will extend to the giving of directions to any State in any matter as to the manner in which the executive power thereof is to be exercised.

**Effect of
Proclama-
tion of
Emergency.**

TOPICAL ANALYSES

A. BRITISH RELATIONS WITH TIBET

The tableland of Tibet stretches northward from the Himalayas and its western and southern frontier marches with Kashmir, the Punjab, Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Upper Burma. The country is almost inaccessible. The government is a monkish and aristocratic theocracy at the head of which are the two Lamas, known as the Dalai Lama of Lhasa and the Tashi Lama of Tashilhunpo. There is an executive council and a national assembly but the conservative influence of the great monasteries is supreme. Since the early years of the eighteenth century Tibet had been under the suzerainty of China, two Chinese officials called Ambans or Residents controlling the policy of the Tibetan government.

British relations with Tibet began from the time of Warren Hastings, who twice sent envoys to Tibet to open up trade with India. But his attempt failed, for the Tibetans disliked the presence of foreigners in their own country. For about a century the land of Tibet remained unknown. But the extension of the British protectorate over Sikkim aroused the interest of the British Government in Tibetan affairs. In 1885-86 they extracted from China a very reluctant consent to the despatch of a British commercial mission to Lhasa, but the Tibetans determined to oppose the entry of the mission. A very awkward situation ensued. Subsequently a new agreement was made with China by which the British Government agreed to abandon the mission on condition that the Chinese waived their claims to sovereignty over Burma and offered no objection to its annexation by Great Britain. In 1887, boundary disputes led the Tibetans to invade Sikkim, an independent state under British protection, but they were driven out with loss. The British Government then took up the matter with China under whose sovereignty Tibet nominally

Condition of
Tibet.

Early
relations.

Convention
with China
with regard
to Tibet.

lay, and in 1890 a convention was concluded, which settled the Sikkim-Tibet boundary and provided for a joint commission to discuss the possibility of frontier trade. But practically no real trade or intercourse followed.

Lord
Curzon's
Tibetan
policy.

In Lord Curzon's time two new conditions developed in Tibetan politics which considerably influenced the British attitude. The Tibetan wanted to free themselves from Chinese suzerainty and showed a desire to welcome Russian influence as a counterpoise. Secondly, the Dalai Lama, unlike most of his predecessors, had contrived to free himself from the tutelage of the aristocracy. In his impending struggle against difficulties, external and internal, he sought the aid of Russia. Lord Curzon, who feared the consequences of the consolidation of Russian influence over Tibet, pressed the British Government at home to adopt a forward policy and to allow a mission to be sent to Tibet. The Russian Government plainly declared that Russia had no designs upon Tibet, but Lord Curzon persisted in believing in the existence of a Tibeto-Russian agreement. He found some flimsy grounds of complaints against Tibet and despatched a mission under Colonel Young-husband in 1903. The Tibetans refused to meet it unless the mission should retire to the frontier and began to mass troops to expel the intruders. A skirmish followed and the Tibetans suffered heavy loss. The British forces then entered Lhasa. The Dalai Lama, having fled away, a treaty was concluded at Lhasa between the Regent and the British in 1904. The treaty provided for the establishment of trade marts at three stations and for the appointment of a British Commercial Agent. The Tibetans undertook to pay an indemnity of 75 lakhs of rupees in annual instalments of one lakh, and to allow the British troops to occupy the Chumbi valley till the whole sum was paid. Other provisions secured to Great Britain direct control over the foreign policy of

The Treaty
of Lhasa,
1904.

Tibet. But in concluding these terms Young-husband had exceeded his powers. Besides, the treaty violated the pledge recently given to Russia that Great Britain would not seek to annex Tibetan territory so long as other Power refrained from interfering in the affairs of Tibet. Hence although the Indian Government defended Young-husband's action, the Secretary of State nullified the terms of the treaty, reducing the indemnity to 25 lakhs and the occupation of the Chumbi valley to three years. The control over Tibetan foreign policy was also tacitly abandoned.

It should be noted that Lord Curzon's aggressive policy in Tibet is hard to justify. It was an unwarranted interference with a weak and independent state. It bears a close resemblance to Lord Lytton's Afghan policy of 1878. The action of both Lord Lytton and Lord Curzon was the outcome of a dread of Russian design and both pressed upon the reluctant Home authorities a vigorous forward policy. Both tried to force a British agent upon a reluctant nation,—Lord Lytton on the Afghans and Curzon on the Tibetans. Eventually the policy of both was disallowed. It is to be further noted that Young-husband's expedition failed in its main object of opening up trade between Tibet and India. Its only result was a temporary setback of the Tibetan national movement, so that the Chinese re-established their authority much more effectively than had been the case before.

Criticism of
Lord
Curzon's
Tibetan
policy.

During Lord Minto's viceroyalty Great Britain and China concluded a convention, which, besides confirming the Treaty of Lhasa, contained two other clauses. By the first, Great Britain bound herself not to annex Tibet, nor to interfere in its internal administration; by the second, China engaged to impose like restrictions on other foreign Powers. Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, completely reversed Lord Curzon's policy by withdrawing British troops from the

Lord
Morley's
policy.

Anglo-
Russian
Convention
with regard
to Tibet.

Chumbi valley when the indemnity was paid off by China. Next followed the *Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907* which settled the integrity of Tibet. (See *ante* p. 185). The result of the British interference in Tibet was that the whole control of the country passed into the hands of China, but the danger of Russian intervention was averted.

B. RELATIONS WITH AFGHANISTAN (1901—1937)

**Relations
with Habi-
bullah
1901—1919.**

The frontier troubles of 1897—98 had put a severe strain upon Anglo-Afghan relations and it was with great difficulty that Amir Abdur Rahman maintained friendly relations with the British Government. This sagacious ruler died in 1901 and was succeeded by his son Habibullah. Lord Curzon had some troubles with the new Amir over the renewal of the treaty which the latter's father had concluded with the British Government. Habibullah maintained that the agreement was between the two countries and as such no renewal was necessary. Lord Curzon on the other hand held that the treaty with Abdur Rahman was a personal one and so it lapsed with his death and had to be renewed. This divergence of opinion led for a time to the cessation of all intercourse between the two countries and Habibullah showed his displeasure by refraining from drawing his subsidy. In 1904 Lord Ampthill, the acting Viceroy during Lord Curzon's absence, sent a mission to Kabul under Sir Louis Dane, and as a consequence better relations were established with the Amir. A treaty was concluded in 1905 by which the previous treaty with Abdur Rahman was renewed and the title of "His Majesty" claimed by Habibullah conceded. It was a triumph for the Amir as his view of the treaty was accepted by the British Government. He consented to draw the arrears of his subsidy. Habibullah maintained the cordial relations thus established and he rendered Great Britain invaluable service during

the First World War by maintaining a policy of friendly neutrality in spite of the incitement of the parties hostile to the British and their allies.

In 1919 Amir Habibullah was assassinated and a struggle for the throne ensued. Amanullah, one of his younger sons, came out victorious. The new Amir at once embarked upon a war with the English in order to please the militarist party and to divert the attention of the people from internal affairs. Thus began the *Third Afghan War* in May 1919. The Afghan army was ill-equipped against the use of aeroplanes and high explosives and so suffered a severe defeat within a few days of the outbreak of the war. Amanullah sued for peace and a treaty was concluded in August 1919 by which the arrears of the late Amir's subsidy were confiscated, no new grant was to be made to Amanullah and the Afghans were prohibited from importing arms and munitions through India. The British Government, however, gave the Amir a free hand to regulate his foreign relations. British interference which in the past had caused so much trouble was now definitely withdrawn from Afghanistan. By another treaty made in 1921 both parties agreed to respect each other's independence. Henceforth an accredited British minister was to reside in Kabul and the Amir was to be represented by his own minister residing in London.

War with
Amanullah
—1919.

Treaty with
Amanullah
—1919.

Amanullah wanted to modernise Afghanistan and tried to carry out sweeping reforms on secular principles. This westernising policy offended the conservative section and antagonised the priestly class. The result was the outbreak of a serious rebellion which forced Amanullah to abdicate in 1929. For a time an illiterate bigot, Bacha-i-Saquo, usurped the throne. He was eventually expelled by Nadir Shah, an able officer of Amanullah. Nadir Shah re-established peace and order and became Amir by general choice. Dur-

Afghan civil
war and the
abdication of
Amanullah.

Nadir Shah. ing this Afghan civil war the British Government observed scrupulous neutrality. Nadir Shah proved himself to be a wise and tactful ruler and proceeded in the path of reform with greater caution and better results. His relations with the British Government were most friendly. He was assassinated by an ignorant fanatic in 1933 and was succeeded by his son Muhammad Zahir who wisely followed in the footsteps of his father.

**Unrest
among
tribesmen
since 1918.**

**Tribal
risings.**

**New
Frontier
policy.**

North-West Frontier:—Lord Curzon's arrangements for dealing with the troubles in the north-west frontier was on the whole satisfactory and worked well till 1914. But his system broke down under the tremendous strain of the Great War of 1914-18. The war engendered a spirit of unrest amongst the Pathans of the border, who were now better equipped with modern weapons of war. "A new feature was their tendency to adopt as their own, grievances of the Indian Nationalist Party." From 1918 onwards there was a series of frontier outbreaks and the British Government had to make extensive military preparations to ward off the tribal menace. The rising of the Waziris in 1919 was a formidable one and entailed fierce fighting. The Mahsuds created troubles in 1925 and the Government had to use the Royal Air Force to put down the outbreak. Next followed the simultaneous rising of the Waziris, Mohands and Afridis in 1930-31 and the movement assumed a very serious character. The Waziris pushed their raid up to the suburbs of Peshawar and demanded the release of Mahatma Gandhi. Other outbreaks followed, that of the Mohand in 1833 and the Tori Khel rebellion of 1936-37. Besides military preparation the British Government adopted the policy of civilising the tribesmen. High roads were constructed through tribal areas, tribesmen were enrolled to police and control the country, and attempts were made to impress upon the tribes the benefits of law and order and peaceful pursuits. It was a forward

policy in a different sense, a "policy not of military conquest but of civilisation." It was in a sense a development of Lord Curzon's policy.

C. BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND THE INDIAN STATES SINCE THE MUTINY

With the assumption of the government of India by the Crown the relations of the Indian States with the British Government entered upon a new phase. Till now these relations were neither uniform nor well-defined as they grew up at different times and under different circumstances. Hence there was much uncertainty about the position and status of the ruling dynasties. Theoretically many of the States were independent under certain specified restrictions, but in practice they were often interfered with and sometimes downright annexed. Failure of natural heirs and misgovernment were the two main grounds of annexation. This policy was now definitely abandoned and the changed outlook found authoritative expression in the pledge given in the Queen's Proclamation of 1858. "We desire no extension of our present territorial possession"—this was the solemn assurance given to the Princes and feudatory chiefs. This assurance was implemented by grants of *sanads* authorising the Princes to adopt sons on failure of natural heirs. The perpetuity of the States was thus guaranteed. Henceforth the British policy was to preserve the States as bulwarks of the British Empire, as "break-waters to storm" that might sweep over the country. The feudatory chiefs were kept in good humour and their loyalty was secured by the grant of high-sounding titles, gun-salutes and other marks of favour.

Change in the British policy towards the States.

Policy of annexation abandoned.

Although the policy of annexation was abandoned the British Government continued to assert the doctrine of paramountcy with increasing emphasis. As early as 1860 Lord Canning affirmed the principle that the Government of

The right to interfere in the states asserted.

**Case of
Baroda.**

India was not precluded "from stepping in to set right such serious abuses in a native government as may threaten any part of the country with anarchy or disturbance, nor from assuming temporary charge of a native state when there shall be sufficient reason to do so." This right to interfere in the internal affairs of the States in case of misgovernment was definitely asserted on several occasions. In 1874 Malhar Rao, Gaikwad of Baroda, was charged with an attempt to poison the British Resident. A Commission was appointed for his trial but its members were divided in opinion as to the guilt of the Prince. So the charge was dropped but Malhar Rao was nevertheless deposed in 1875 for "notorious misconduct and gross misgovernment." A child prince distantly connected with the ruling family, was then set up on the throne with Sir Madhab Rao, a Maratha statesman, as chief minister. Thus there was no return to Dalhousie's policy of annexation, but at the same time there was drastic interference in the internal affairs of Baroda. (See p. 139.) A similar example of interference is afforded by the case of Manipur where a similar policy was also followed. In 1890 there was a disputed succession in Manipur and the British Government interfered by deciding to banish Tikendrajit, the local *Senapati* or Commander-in-Chief. The Chief Commissioner of Assam was sent to Manipur to control the situation, but he with four members of his staff, was captured and publicly beheaded. A strong British force was dispatched to avenge this murder and the *Senapati* and his accomplices were executed. A boy Raja was placed upon the throne and during his minority Manipur was administered by a British Political Agent (See p. 167).

**Interference
in Manipur.****Rendition
of Mysore.**

The changed policy of the British Government is also demonstrated by the "rendition of Mysore" in 1881. Mysore was sequestered by Lord William Bentinck in 1831 but Lord Ripon restored it to its lawful ruler. But in restoring the State the

Government frankly asserted its paramountcy. The ruler of Mysore was required to "remain faithful in allegiance and subordination to Her Majesty" and he was to bind himself to the "good government of the people of Mysore." Thus under the crown the stability and security of the Indian States increased but at the same time there followed a steady decline in their status. Under the Company the States were at least, in theory, independent although their independence was subject to certain reservations. But the Royal Titles Act of 1876 by which Queen Victoria assumed the imperial title of *Kaiser-i-Hind* or Empress of India, inaugurated a new policy. This change of title implied a subtle but undeclared change in the status of the feudatory princes. They ceased to be allies and became vassals of the British sovereign. This change in the relationship is reflected in the stringent conditions attached to the rendition of Mysore. In 1891 the Secretary of State developed this policy by declaring that every succession must be recognised by the British Government and "no succession is valid until recognition has been given." In 1926 Lord Reading in connection with the British interference in the Nizam's State reminded the Nizam that "the right of the British Government to intervene in the internal affairs of Indian States is another instance of the consequences necessarily involved in the supremacy of the British Crown.....The varying degrees of internal sovereignty which the Rulers enjoy are all subject to the due exercise by the Paramount Power of its ultimate responsibility for the welfare of the people of States." In other words, the British Government would interfere and take remedial action if the States failed to maintain a high level of good government.

Decline in the status of Indian States due to the Royal Titles Act of 1876.

Lord Reading's declaration of policy —1926.

The British Government while tightening its control over the Indian princes, realised the necessity of securing their co-operation in view of the troubled political situation after the partition of Bengal. Lord Curzon and Lord Minto wanted

Chamber of
Princes
—1921.

to form a consultative body composed of representatives of different States. The need for such a body to co-operate with the British Government became greater because of the difficulties created by the Great War of 1914-18. Lord Hardinge had this plan in his mind when in 1916 he described the Indian princes as "helpers and colleagues in the great task of imperial rule." The Montague-Chelmsford Report made a definite recommendation for the creation of a "permanent consultative body" and so the Chamber of Princes was set up by a Royal Proclamation in 1921. The Chamber was to be a consultative body in matters concerning British India and the States in common.

Report of
the Butler
Committee
—1929.

Meanwhile the Princes were getting restive. The gradual Indianisation of the Government made them very sensitive about their position and prestige. They shrank from the idea of acknowledging the suzerainty of Indian ministers responsible to popularly elected legislatures. For some time past they had been protesting against the extent to which the Paramount Power interfered in their domestic affairs. Besides they had their grievances in regard to the tariff policy of the Government and the collection of customs revenue. Hence in 1927 the Secretary of State appointed the *Indian States Committee* presided over by Sir Harcourt Butler to investigate the nature of relationship between the Paramount Power and the Indian States and to make recommendations for adjusting the fiscal relations between British India and the Indian States. The report of the Butler Committee was published in 1929. It insisted that "Paramountcy must remain paramount" but at the same declared that a new Indian Government responsible to an Indian legislature could not take over the existing duties of the British Government towards the States without their rulers' consent. The Government of India Act of 1935 provided for a scheme for the accession of the States to the proposed Federation.

But the Federal part of the Act was to come into force only when a specific number of States had acceded to it.

D. FISCAL POLICY SINCE THE MUTINY

The tariff policy of the British Government of India was in the beginning mainly dictated by considerations of revenue. Subsequently, it was greatly influenced by the prevailing free trade doctrines of the time and by consideration of the interests of Lancashire. The history of Indian tariff since the Mutiny till the outbreak of Great War (1914) shows a progressive reduction of customs duties. General principles.

In 1860, James Wilson, the first finance member, imposed an *ad valorem* duty of 10 p.c. on all imports, and 3 p.c. on the majority of exports. This tariff was revised in 1864 when Sir John Lawrence reduced the import duties to seven-half p.c. From the year 1875, the tariff policy of the Government became the subject of keen controversy. In England, the doctrine of the free trade had, by this time, become the guiding principle of commerce, and the Government of India taking their cue from British statesmen adopted an attitude of uncompromising free trade. Besides, the successful establishment of cotton mills in Bombay alarmed the Lancashire manufacturers who began to agitate for the removal of the duties on cotton goods imported into India from England. In 1875, Lord Northbrook lowered the customs duties to 5 p.c. and at the same time abolished the majority of export duties. But this did not suit the selfish policy of the Lancashire manufacturers who insisted on the total abolition of the import duty on cotton goods. Northbrook, however, sturdily refused to do so although strong pressure was put upon him by the British Cabinet. He declared that the Indian exchequer could not afford to surrender so valuable an item in its revenue and that it was politically unwise to give Northbrook's policy.

Pressure
from
Lancashire.

any opportunity for the belief that the interests of Lancashire were to override those of India. But Lancashire continued the agitation and the Indian Government had to yield. In 1878, Lord Lytton remitted the import duties on a number of articles and next year removed the duties on the coarser kinds of cotton cloth on which the import of 5 p.c. had some protective effects. This he did in the teeth of well-reasoned protests both from the officials and the people.

Lord
Lytton's
tariff policy.

The exemption of cotton goods which provided the bulk of the customs revenue rendered anomalous the retention of other import duties and so in 1882 Major Evelyn Baring removed from the tariff all the five per cent *ad valorem* import duties which could have any protective force. The only duties left were those on salt, liquors, arms, and ammunition. From 1882 to 1894 no fresh import duties were imposed except a small one on petroleum.

1894—1914.

The fiscal arrangement made in 1882 remained in force till 1894 when a heavy fall in the exchange value of the rupee forced the Government to modify the tariff. On account of the loss in exchange the Government was faced with a heavy deficit and so was compelled to reimpose the old general duty of five per cent on all imports. Under pressure from Lancashire, cotton goods were at first exempted. But as the financial difficulties continued, the Government was forced to include the cotton goods in the general tariff. But lest the imposition of five per cent import duty on Manchester goods should give even a small amount of protection to the Indian cotton mills, the Government of India, submissive to the Lancashire pressure, imposed a countervailing excise duty of five per cent on cotton yarns of twenty counts and above, produced in Indian mills. Indian opinion bitterly resented the excise duty and held up the policy of favouring Lancashire sentiments on the free trade question.

Excise duty
on cotton
yarns.

as the cynical commentary upon the honesty of British rule. In 1896, both the import and excise duties on cotton goods were reduced from five to three-half per cent.

The general tariff at the rate of five per cent imposed in 1894 remained in its essentials unaltered until the outbreak of the Great War when financial necessities led to a progressive enhancement of the customs duties.

The war had given a temporary stimulus to Indian industries but the resulting prosperity proved short-lived. With peace came foreign competition which threatened many industries which had expanded under war conditions. Hence the people demanded a revision of the tariff in favour of Indian industries and pressed for the adoption of a policy of protection. This demand was supported by the Montague-Chelmsford Report, and the Parliamentary Committee of 1919 representing both Houses, recommended the grant of full fiscal autonomy to India. In 1921 a Fiscal Commission was appointed which declared in favour of a policy of 'discriminate protection.' The Government accepted the recommendations of the commission and set up a Tariff Board in 1923 to examine the claims of various industries to protection. The Board has granted protection to many industries such as iron and steel, cotton, paper, sugar, salt and other industries. As a consequence the volume of British trade with India has appreciably decreased and that of other foreign countries increased. By the Ottawa Trade Agreement of 1932 important changes were introduced into the Indian tariff policy by the adoption of the principle of Imperial Preference. By it in the matter of import duties certain margins of preference were given to British goods and those of the British colonies on their importation into India. The soundness of this policy has been questioned by Indian politicians who held that it

Indian demand for a policy of protection.

Fiscal autonomy conceded.

Tariff Board.

Ottawa agreement of 1932.

would work to the detriment of India's wider interests.

E. FAMINE POLICY

India in the main is an agricultural country but agriculture in India is largely a "gamble in rains." Hence failure of rains spells economic ruin to millions of people and starvation to many more. The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed a series of devastating famines and in many cases the loss of life was appalling. In 1866 Orissa was in the grip of a terrible famine and about one-fourth of the population died of starvation and of the epidemic diseases which followed in its wake. In 1873-74 Bihar and parts of Bengal suffered from a famine of a less severe character. Next followed a very severe famine in 1876 during the Viceroyalty of Lord Lytton. It lasted for two years and extended over wide areas in Mysore, Madras and Bombay Presidencies, the United Provinces and portions of the Punjab. There was no uniform system of relief operations and so the measures adopted by the Government to afford relief to the famine-stricken people on these occasions varied in different areas with varying results. In most cases the relief given was inadequate and ineffective and very often the result obtained were unsatisfactory, not being commensurate with the expenditure involved. To Lord Lytton belongs the credit of realising the importance of formulating general principles of famine relief. For this purpose he appointed a strong commission under Sir Richard Strachey. The recommendations of this commission formed the basis of the famous Famine Code of 1883.

The great
famine
of 1876.

Principles
of famine
relief as
laid down
by the
Famine
Code of
1883.

First the Commission recommended certain obvious measures of relief such as suspension and remission of land-revenue and rents, distribution of food, and grant of loans for the purchase of seed-grain and bullocks. Besides suggesting these necessary measures the Commission laid down the very sound principle that relief

should also be administered in the shape of providing work for the able-bodied men and distributing doles only to the aged and infirm. The works provided should be of big scale and of permanent utility and should be undertaken as quickly as possible before the physical degeneration of the people sets in. To meet unforeseen expenses caused by famine it was decided to create a Famine Relief and Insurance Fund for which the Government of India was to set apart fifteen millions of rupees every year. These principles were acted on in cases of subsequent famines and were put to a severe test during the famine of 1896—97 which was one of unexampled magnitude. It affected the United Provinces, Bihar, the Central Provinces, Madras and Bombay. Close upon its heels followed another severe famine in 1899—1900. Lord Curzon remarked that about one-fourth of the entire population of India "had come to a greater or less degree, within the radius of relief operations."

Famines
of 1896
and 1899.

Hence another Famine Commission was appointed in 1901. It fully endorsed the principles of the Famine Code of 1883 but laid special stress on local public works as against large-scale public work till now undertaken by the Government in relief operations. It also stressed the importance of utilising non-official agencies on a larger scale than before in the matter of distributing relief. Lastly, it recommended the creation of agricultural banks, improved methods of agriculture and extension of irrigation work. The Commission stressed the importance of "moral strategy" or "putting heart into the people", that is, the people should be helped as soon as danger is sensed by the prompt and liberal grants of *sakkari* loans, by organising private charity and by the enlistment of non-official help. These resolutions were accepted and implemented by the Government and formed the basis of the present famine relief policy.

Famine
Commis-
sion
of 1900.

F. EDUCATIONAL POLICY SINCE 1854

**Educational
Despatch
of 1854.**

**Foundation
of Univer-
sities.**

**Hunter
Commission
of 1882.**

**Lord
Curzon's
policy.**

The policy of the British Government in regard to the education of the people is based upon the famous Education Despatch of Sir Charles Wood, published in 1854. (See p. 113.) It sketched in outline a complete scheme of public education controlled and aided by the Government. The policy embodied in the Despatch was confirmed by the Secretary of State in 1859 and as a consequence a network of schools and colleges spread all over India. A special rate on land was levied in aid of education. Under Lord Canning Universities were founded in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay in 1857 on the model of the London University.

In 1882 during the viceroyalty of Lord Ripon a Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir William Hunter to inquire into the extent to which the principles of the Despatch of 1854 had been actually carried out. The Commission endorsed the policy of 1854, laying special stress upon primary education which, it pointed out, had not made satisfactory progress. It recommended that the primary schools should be managed by local bodies like Municipal and District Boards. It suggested that as far as possible education should be free from official control and recommended the "progressive devolution of primary, secondary and collegiate education upon private enterprise and continuous withdrawal of Government from competition therewith." The Commission observed that the system of grants-in-aid had worked very well and recommended its extension. The report of the Commission was approved by the Government with the result that the number of schools and colleges increased.

Lord Curzon adopted the opposite policy of greater official control of education. In 1902 he appointed a commission to investigate the conditions of the Universities and to recommend measures for the improvement of their constitution and

standard of teaching. The recommendations of the commission were embodied in the Universities Act of 1904. This Act was intended to bring the educational institutions of the country under stricter control of the Government by restricting the number of senators and providing for a majority of nominated members in the University Senates. It provided for closer inspection of colleges and more stringent regulations for their affiliation. The rules and regulations framed by the senates must be approved of by the Government. The Act at the same time recognised the need of converting the universities from mere examining boards to teaching institutions and recommended equipments like museums and laboratories. The Act was very unpopular for it gave rise to the suspicion that, under the pretext of reform, the Government were handing over the control of the Universities to European officials and missionaries "with a view to sabotaging Indian private enterprise in the field of higher education." But it should be noted that Lord Curzon's idea of teaching universities was a sound one. His remark that "the university is nothing more than the final stage in the long irksome series of examinations" is very true. He further said, "while we trim the wick of intellect with mechanical accuracy, we have hardly learned how to light up the lamp of the soul." That this remark is applicable even to this day is beyond denial.

Universities
Act of 1904.

Increase of
official
control over
education.

In 1910 a Department of Education was established in the Government of India with a member of its own to represent it in the Executive Council. The Government adopted a Resolution in 1913 for the establishment of teaching and residential universities but the outbreak of the Great War of 1914—18 delayed the reforms envisaged in it. The progress of education has been reviewed from time to time by several Commissions appointed by the Government. The Calcutta University Commission presided over by Sir

The Sadler
Commission

Growth of
new Uni-
versities.

Michael Sadler submitted its report in 1919. It made important recommendations for the organisation of higher education and laid stress upon research work. Its report "bore fruit in the establishment of a number of unitary teaching universities, of which Lucknow in the north, Patna in the east and Annamalai in the south were typical examples." The University of Delhi is a further type of a teaching university composed of federated colleges. Communal consciousness has also helped the cause of higher education for it led to the establishment of new universities like the Hindu University at Benares and the Muslim University at Aligrah. The Government set up important institutions to look after the progress of education, of which the two most noteworthy are the Central Advisory Board of Education created in 1920 and the Inter-University Board of India started in 1925. Education was made a provincial subject in charge of Ministers by the Act of 1919.

Primary
education.

The progress of primary education has not been so satisfactory as that of higher education. As early as 1911, G. K. Gokhale, then a member of the Imperial Legislative Council, introduced a Bill for the introduction of free and compulsory primary education. The Bill was not passed but since then the matter has been drawing increasing public attention. The Punjab was the first province to make a notable progress in elementary education under the impulse of Sir Fazli Husain. The movement thus started resulted in the Sargent plan of the Government. At the same time the Congress brought forward its Wardha scheme. Both these plans sought to bring education within the easy reach of the masses though their method of approach was different. The question of illiteracy and primary education has been taken up by several Provincial Legislatures and some of them passed Acts authorising the introduction of compulsory education by "local option."

G. AGRICULTURAL POLICY

It was the pressure of famines that roused the Government to the necessity of improving agriculture by state action. The recommendations of the Famine Commission of 1880 led to the establishment of Agricultural Departments in different provinces. But in the beginning these Departments had to work under serious financial and other handicaps and so they could do very little beyond a certain amount of statistical work. It was Lord Curzon who reorganised and improved the Agricultural Departments and placed sufficient funds at their disposal for the development of agricultural research, experiments and demonstration. In 1901 an Inspector-General of Agriculture was appointed to advise the Imperial and Provincial Governments. In 1903 the Pusa Institute was started together with a college for imparting advanced agricultural training, both theoretical and practical. In 1905 an all-India Board of Agriculture was established with the object of co-ordinating the work of the Provincial Departments. At their annual meetings the departmental officers from various provinces discussed their programmes of work and made recommendations to the Imperial Government. New agricultural colleges began to be started. One was founded at Poona in 1908 and in subsequent years similar colleges were established at Nagpur, Cawnpore, Coimbatore, Lyallpur and other places. The Director of the Agricultural Institute, Pusa, was the Agricultural Adviser to the Government of India up to 1929.

Lord Curzon's measures for agricultural improvement.

Agricultural colleges.

With the introduction of the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919 agriculture became transferred subject and came under the control of a provincial minister. "The Central Ministry of Agriculture now concerns itself with agricultural problems of all-India importance." It maintains a number of research institutions relating to

vetterinary work, animal husbandry, cattle-breeding, diseases and pests of plants, etc.

Royal Commission on agriculture. In 1927 a Royal Commission on Agriculture was appointed under the presidentship of Lord Linlithgow to report on the condition of agriculture and suggest measures of improvement. The Commission emphasised the need of research and experiment, and on its recommendations an Imperial Council of Agricultural Research was established. Its primary function is to guide and co-ordinate agricultural research throughout India. "It acts as a clearing-house of information in regard to agricultural and veterinary matters." To report on the work done by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research two experts, Sir John Russel and Dr. N. C. Wright, were invited in 1936. They made useful recommendations for bridging the gulf between the research worker and the cultivator, for tackling insect pests, soil conservation, etc. The Government have also started schemes for affording better facilities for the marketing of agricultural produce.

Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.

The provincial Departments of Agriculture are doing useful work for the improvement of agriculture on new lines. They carry on experiment and research, and organise propaganda to teach the cultivators new methods and to induce them to use improved implements, artificial manures and better seeds for varieties of crops. They also conduct demonstrations for the benefit of cultivators.

APPENDIX A

Growth of Indian Constitution

The history of the evolution of British Indian constitution is the story of the interference of British Parliament in the affairs of India. In the early days of the Company its three important settlements of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta were each under the charge of a Governor who was assisted by a council of merchants and writers. The ultimate authority rested with the Courts of Directors and Proprietors who exercised their power subject to the nominal control of Parliament. As the Company gradually developed from a purely mercantile body into a territorial power, it established a "double government" in the provinces where its influence was supreme. This was the case in Bengal and Madras. In both the provinces, the internal government was in the hands of the Nawab while the Company managed the military defence. This system of "double government" with its faulty division of duties led to gross corruption and misgovernment and so in the interest of good government the British Parliament began to interfere in the affairs of India. The Indian constitution is the product of such Parliamentary interference. The development of the constitution falls into two well-marked periods, viz., (A) under the Company and (B) under the Crown.

(A) **Under the Company** :—The first Parliamentary interference in the Company's affairs was the famous *Regulating Act* of 1773. This Act definitely subjected the Company to the control of Parliament by requiring the Directors to submit to the King's ministers copies of all material correspondence regarding the affairs of the Company (See p. 37-38). This was followed by *Pitt's India Act* of 1784, which practically abolished the ruling powers of the Company by placing the Indian affairs under a Board of Control consisting of six commissioners directly appointed by the Crown. (See p. 51-52). The 'double government' of the Crown and Company set up by Pitt's Act subsisted with little material change until 1858. At each renewal of the Company Charter, viz., in 1813, 1833 and 1853 the Company's privileges, specially commercial, were curtailed but no further change of importance was made in the system of the Government.

(B) **Under the Crown** :—After the Mutiny the Government of India was transferred from the Company to the Crown by '*An Act for the Better Government of India*' (See p. 121). This transfer was announced to the people by the famous Proclamation of Queen Victoria (1858) which laid down the principles on which the administration of India was to be conducted. The subsequent evolution of the India constitution is chiefly concerned with enlargement of the Legislative and Executive Councils, effected gradually by the *three Indian Councils Act* of 1861, 1892 and 1909 (See pp. 129, and 182). The net result of these successive changes has been to increase the number of elected members of the Legislative Councils and confer

them greater freedom of discussion and criticism. By the *Government of India Act, 1919*, considerable changes were introduced in the system of administration. In addition to Bombay, Madras and Bengal, other Provinces such as the Punjab, United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, N.-W. F. Province and Sind were each placed under a Governor with an Executive Council and were given larger powers over their own affairs specially in financial matters. In other words, much progress has been made in the direction of decentralisation. The Provincial Legislative Councils were allowed to have an elected majority of 70 per cent with power to vote grants of money. (For other provisions of the Act See p. 187-88). Lastly came the *Government of India Act of 1935* which established Provincial Autonomy. (See p. 215-18).

Growth of the Judicial System

When the Company received the grant of the 'Diwani' of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, it kept up the existing administrative arrangements as far as possible. The judicial functions continued to be exercised by the Nawab's officers and even the revenue administration was left in the hands of the native agents under the superintendence of English supervisors. This system proved a complete failure. Warren Hastings established a Civil and Criminal Court in each district. The civil courts were presided over by the English officers called Collectors, who aided by native officials looked after the collection of revenue as well as dispensed civil justice. The criminal courts, on the other hand, remained in charge of the Indian judges who administered only the Muhammadan Law. Hastings also set up two courts of appeal, one for civil cases, called *Sadr Diwani Adalat*, presided over by the Governor and two members of the Council, and the other for criminal cases, called *Sadr Nizamat Adalat* presided over by a Muhammadan judge. The next important change in the judicial system was introduced by the Regulating Act of 1773 which set up a Supreme Court at Calcutta, consisting of a Chief Justice and three judges. This led to a conflict of jurisdiction between the Supreme Court, the powers of which were not clearly defined, and the Council which controlled the Company's courts. Hastings sought to avoid this conflict by appointing Sir Elijah Impey, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to be the head of the Company's Courts as well. An amending Act of Parliament passed in 1781 duly defined the duties of the Supreme Court and legalised the Company's Courts (See p. 41).

The next important advance in the judicial system was made by Lord Cornwallis (See p. 54). He established an ascending hierarchy of Civil Courts, viz., District Courts in each district under a European judge and four Provincial Courts of Appeal, each under three European judges. For criminal cases Courts of Circuit were established and these were presided over by the judges of the Provincial Courts. The criminal jurisdiction of the Deputy Nawab or Naib Nazim was thus finally abolished. At the same time, the *Sadr Nizamat Adalat* was taken over by the Governor-General and

APPENDIX

Council. The Muhammadan criminal law continued in force but its severities were mitigated. Cornwallis separated the revenue from judicial functions and the Collectors, who hitherto performed both these functions, were confined to revenue work alone. This separation between the judicial and revenue services was abolished by Marquis of Hastings. Lord William Bentinck made a few important changes. He abolished the provincial courts, entrusted the Collectors with certain classes of judicial work and combined the office of District Magistrate with that of Collectors. (See p. 94).

The dualism between the Supreme Court and the Sadar Adalats was abolished in 1861 when Chartered High Courts were established, one in each Presidency.

APPENDIX B

SYSTEMS OF LAND TENURE

(Revenue Administration)

In British India three systems of land settlement are found, viz., (a) *the Permanent Settlement*, (b) *Ryotwari Settlement* and (c) *the Mahalwari or Village Settlement*.

(1) **The Permanent Settlement** :—The Zemindars were originally agents of the Muhammadan Government for the collection of revenue and had no right to the land. But in course of time their office became hereditary and they managed to acquire some sort of ownership in the soil. It was with these Zemindars that Lord Cornwallis made the Permanent Settlement in 1793. This settlement occurs in Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Benares and the north-eastern part of Madras. By it the Zemindars were recognised as *proprietors* of the soil with the rights of free hereditary succession, but subject to the loss of their property on failure to pay the stipulated revenue on a fixed date. The State demand was declared fixed in perpetuity. The fixity of tenure thus ensured to the Zemindars, resulted in creating a rich and loyal body between the Government and the people. The Zemindars were conspicuous for their loyalty during the Mutiny. The only serious defect of the Permanent Settlement is that the Government is precluded from sharing in the increased profits of production. This loss of revenue has necessitated a general increase of taxation so that the rest of British India has to pay heavier taxes as the result of the landlords of the permanently settled districts enjoying a purely unearned increment. (See p. 56.)

(2) **The Ryotwari Settlement** :—This settlement was introduced at first in Madras by Sir Thomas Munro and was afterwards extended to Bombay and Sind. According to it the Government deals directly with the ryots or cultivators and recognises no middleman. Each village is carefully surveyed and assessed. The rental is fixed for a number of years. As long as

the registered cultivator pays the assessment he is entitled to hold the land for ever and his right to occupancy can be inherited and transferred. The tenant can relinquish his holding, and protection has been ensured to the improvements made by him.

(3) **The Mahalwari or Village Settlement** :—This form of settlement prevails in the U. P., the Punjab and the Central Provinces. In Oudh the Government deals with the Taluqdars or middlemen. The groundwork of this system was prepared by Robert-Mertins Bird and it was completed by *James Thompson*. According to it the revenue is settled for a limited period (30 years in the U. P. and 20 years in the Punjab and C. P.) with the *entire body of villagers* who are jointly and separately responsible for the revenue of the whole village. The headman of the village, called the Lambardar, signs the agreement with the Government on behalf of the villagers. Thus, in this system the Government deals only with the middlemen. In Oudh the Government settles the revenue of a group of villages, for the usual period of 30 years, with a *Taluqdar*. The Taluqdar has no absolute right over his estates and is no better than a big revenue-farmer with certain pecuniary gain allowed to him by the Government.

APPENDIX C

(1) Relation of the Company with Oudh till its Annexation

The political relations of the Company with the kingdom of Oudh began as follows :—Mir Kasim, the Nawab of Bengal, was driven to revolt by the corruption and high-handed proceedings of the Company's officials. He was, however, defeated and compelled for a time to seek the protection of Shuja-ud-daula, the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh. The Nawab-Wazir, accordingly, advanced towards Bengal, but was defeated by the English at *Buxar* in 1764. All Oudh now lay at the mercy of the British who, however, thought it politic to treat the vanquished ruler with moderation. In the political arrangements that accompanied the grant of the *Diwani*, Clive allowed the Nawab-Wazir to be reinstated in all his possessions except Kora and Allahabad which were made over to the titular Emperor, Shah Alam. At the same time a defensive alliance was concluded whereby the Company engaged to provide the Nawab-Wazir with troops for the defence of his frontiers if he consented to furnish the cost of the maintenance. Thus was Oudh brought for the first time within the sphere of the British politics. Clive's lenient treatment of the Nawab-Wazir was prompted by political considerations, *viz.*, to ensure the safety of Bengal by making Oudh a buffer state between that province and the Marathas.

Warren Hastings, in his dealings with Oudh, followed in the footsteps of Clive but his policy was at the same time greatly influenced by considerations of pecuniary advantage to the Company. He snatched away Allahabad and

Kora from Shah Alam and sold them to the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh on the plea that the Emperor had placed himself under the protection of the Marathas. This measure strengthened the position of the Nawab as well as brought money to the Company. Hastings next concluded the treaty of Benares by which in consideration of a large sum of money he agreed to help the Nawab-Wazir in his designs upon Rohilkhand. The outcome of this engagement was the Rohilla War which resulted in the annexation of Rohilkhand to the kingdom of Oudh. This affair, though questionable, secured a strong frontier for Oudh and strengthened its position as a buffer state between Bengal and the Marathas. It also filled the coffers of the Company. Later on, Hastings sent British troops to help the Nawab-Wazir in plundering the Begums of Oudh so that the former might discharge his financial obligations to the Company.

The next Governor-General to interfere in the affairs of Oudh was Sir *John Shore*. On the death of Asaf-ud-daula, the Nawab-Wazir of Oudh, Shore set aside a reputed son of the late Nawab, who had seized the throne and replaced him by his own nominee. A treaty was made with the new Nawab by which the latter ceded Allahabad to the Company and agreed to maintain a British force at an enormous cost for the defence of his kingdom (See p. 61). *Lord Wellesley* forced upon the Nawab a subsidiary treaty by which the latter was deprived of about half of his territory for the maintenance of the subsidiary troops (See p. 67). Oudh was finally annexed to the British Empire by Lord Dalhousie on the ground of misgovernment. (See p. 110).

(2) Relation of the British with the Nizam

The death of the Nizam Asaf Jah in 1748 was followed by a disputed succession in which the English and the French took opposite sides. This was the first interference of the English in the affairs of the Nizam. The Anglo-French rivalry that followed was terminated by the defeat of the French at Wandiwash in 1761. After that the Nizam on the whole remained on friendly terms with the British. In 1765, Clive obtained from the Emperor Shah Alam the grant of the Northern Circars along with that of the Diwani of Bengal. The Nizam acquiesced in the surrender of the Northern Circars on condition that the English should pay him a yearly tribute. This was followed by an alliance between the Nizam and the English by which the latter agreed to support the former against Haidar Ali and the Marathas (1765). But the alliance did not prove lasting and in 1767 the Nizam joined Haidar Ali against the English. Their combined forces were, however, defeated by Colonel Smith at Trinomali. In spite of their victory the English concluded a humiliating treaty with the Nizam (Treaty of Masulipatam in 1768) by which they agreed to an offensive and defensive alliance with the Nizam and to pay him tribute for the Northern Circars (See p. 31).

During the First Maratha War the attitude of the Nizam became hostile to the English. He looked with disfavour on the alliance which the Bombay Government had made with his enemy, Raghoba. This coupled with the

annexation of the Guntur district by the British, led him in 1779 to form a strong confederacy including almost all the Maratha Chiefs and Haidar Ali. Warren Hastings restored Guntur to the Nizam and thereby secured his neutrality in the Second Mysore War (See p. 46). Thenceforth the Nizam remained the ally of the English. Lord Cornwallis in order to please the Nizam agreed to help him against Tipu Sultan and thus provoked the Third Mysore War. The Nizam co-operated with the English and obtained a share of the territory which Tipu was compelled to part with (See p. 59). Sir John Shore, however, offended the Nizam by refusing to help him against the Marathas. The result was that the Nizam was defeated by the Marathas at the Battle of Khardn in 1795. Henceforth he became estranged from the British and employed a distinguished French Officer, Raymond, to train his troops (See p. 60). Lord Wellesley induced the Nizam to dismiss the French Officer and to enter into a subsidiary alliance with the Company. During the Fourth Mysore War the Nizam helped the English and was given a share of the Mysore territory. But the Nizam surrendered his acquisitions in lieu of the payment for the subsidiary force. In Sir George Barlow's time the Nizam intrigued to subvert the alliance with the British Government but was checked. Thenceforth friendly relation continued with the British Government and during the Mutiny the Nizam rendered valuable assistance to the British. These were duly rewarded by territorial concessions and remissions of debt to the Company.

(3) **Relation of the British with the Marathas** (See *Review*, p. 87).

(4) **Relation of the British with the Sikhs** :—It was during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Minto that the British came into contact with the newly-risen Sikh power. The attempt of Ranjit Singh to extend his power beyond the Sutlej led Lord Minto to despatch Charles Metcalfe as his envoy to the Sikh court. The result was the *Treaty of Amritsar* establishing perpetual amity between the Sikh government and the British. This friendship continued as long as Ranjit Singh lived (See p. 78). Lord William Bentinck renewed this treaty of alliance and entertained Ranjit Singh with great ceremony at Rupar (See p. 95). Lord Auckland courted the alliance of Ranjit Singh on the eve of the outbreak of the First Afghan War and the Sikh government became a party to the "Tripartite" treaty of 1838 which was formed to depose Dost Muhammad and to restore Shah Shuja. On Ranjit Singh's death in 1839, the Sikh government became a prey to internal revolution and the army became uncontrollable. So it was let loose against the British territory and the First Sikh War began during the administration of Lord Hardinge (1845) (See p. 105). The Sikh power was crippled but not crushed. The revolt of Mulraj, governor of Multan, during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Dalhousie led to the Second Sikh War which culminated in the annexation of the Punjab. (See p. 107).

Relation with Mysore :—The rise of Haidar Ali was a menace to the neighbouring Powers and so in 1766, the Madras government joined the Nizam

and the Marathas in a coalition against him. In the First Mysore War that followed, Haidar succeeded in detaching the Marathas and the Nizam and then frightened the British into coming to terms. The peace which followed in 1769 provided for the mutual restitution of conquests and reciprocal assistance in defensive war. The English, however, incurred the displeasure of Haidar Ali by refusing to help him when he was attacked by the Marathas in 1771 (See p. 32). So, when on the outbreak of the war between the English and the French in 1778 the former seized the town of Mahe, Haidar remonstrated, but in vain. Thereupon Haidar declared war against the English. The Second Mysore War, thus begun, was continued after Haidar's death by his son, Tipu Sultan, till 1784 when it was brought to a close by the Treaty of Mangalore. Lord Cornwallis violated this treaty by agreeing to help the Nizam in recovering certain territories secured to Tipu by the said treaty. Thereupon Tipu who hated the English bitterly, commenced hostilities by attacking Travancore, a protected ally of the Company. In the Third Mysore War which thus began, Tipu was completely defeated and compelled to cede about half of his territory. (See p. 59). Encouraged by the non-intervention policy of Sir John Shore, Tipu began to intrigue with the French against the English. So when Lord Wellesley came as Governor-General he declared war against Tipu. In the Fourth Mysore War that followed Tipu was defeated and killed and the greater portion of Mysore was partitioned between the Company and the Nizam. The residue was given to a member of the old Hindu royal family which had been displaced by Haidar Ali.

APPENDIX D

Biographical Notes

Ranjit Singh :—Born in 1780, Ranjit succeeded at the age of twelve to the headship of the Sukarchukea 'misal.' In 1799, at the age of nineteen he rendered valuable help to Zaman Shah, the ruler of Kabul, during his invasion of India. He was rewarded for his services with the governorship of Lahore with the title of Raja. In 1802 he conquered Amritsar, the holy city of the Sikhs. Next he threw off the Afghan yoke and gradually brought all other 'misals' west of the Sutlej under his control. With the growth of his power he was seized with the idea of Pan-Sikhism. He wanted to unify and mould all the Sikh States into a well-ordered commonwealth. To do this it was necessary for him to extend his power over the Cis-Sutlej Sikhs, that is, over the Sikhs who dwelt on the east of the Sutlej. He soon got an opportunity. This Cis-Sutlej Sikhs were often engaged in quarrel among themselves, and some of them implored his help. Thereupon Ranjit Singh crossed the Sutlej and occupied Ludhiana in 1806. Next year he repeated his expedition on the pretext of settling disputes among the local Sikhs. Ranjit's activity alarmed some of this Cis-Sutlej Sikh chiefs who did not like his pan-Sikhism. They sought British intervention to check his aggressions. Lord Minto saw the

HISTORY OF INDIA

danger of the extension of Sikh power beyond the Sutlej. So he sent Charles Metcalfe to negotiate with the Sikh leader. By the Treaty of Amritsar which was concluded in 1809 Ranjit agreed not to extend his supremacy beyond the Sutlej, and established "perpetual amity" with the British Government. This promise he honourably kept as long as he lived. In fact, his statesmanship lay in the recognition of the power of the British arms and that was why he remained the friend and faithful ally of the British Government.

Checked on the eastern frontier, Ranjit Singh continued his career of conquest on the north and west. Gradually he brought the whole of the Punjab under his sway. In 1813 he inflicted a signal defeat upon the Afghans at Haidaru and captured Attock, the key to the frontier. He took Multan in 1818 and Kashmir in 1819. Next he took great care to train his army according to European fashion, and for that purpose, took into his service two of Napoleon's veteran officers who had fought at Waterloo. He took advantage of the disorders in Afghanistan that followed on the expulsion of Shah Suja and conquered Peshwar which became tributary to him in 1823. The same year he defeated the Afghans for the second time at Nowshera. In 1831 he proposed to Lord William Bentinck the partition of Sind but his proposal was not accepted. Bentinck, however, kept him in good humour by paying him a highly ceremonial visit at Rupur and managed to renew the old treaty of alliance with him. His object was to utilise Ranjit's help in warding off the suspected Russian invasion of India. Ranjit Singh agreed to co-operate with the English in restoring the exiled Shah Suja to the throne of Kabul and was a party to the Tripartite Treaty of 1839, but he died the same year.

A born leader of men, gifted with an iron will, shrewd and intelligent to a degree, Ranjit Singh stands as one of the great personalities of Indian history. His great achievement was to weld the scattered 'misls' into a strong state and to defend his kingdom against the warlike Afghans and the turbulent frontier tribes. His was a military government, stern and autocratic, but it never degenerated into tyranny. It was not over-centralised. He allowed subordinate rights to remain and protected them. He upheld the best tradition of Indian monarchy by his policy of religious toleration. "Sir Charles Metcalfe admired Ranjit Singh for his unprejudiced use of talented men of all religions."

Haidar Ali :—Haidar Ali was one of the ablest and most successful adventurers known to Indian history. He began his career as an ordinary *Naik* in the army of the Hindu State of Mysore and eventually made himself its master. Not only that, he made Mysore a powerful state dreaded by the English and the Marathas alike. (See p. 30).

His relations with the Marathas :—Encouraged by the disaster of the Marathas at Panipat (1761) Haidar began to aggrandise himself at their expense. He occupied a large portion of the Maratha territory in the Carnatic and even began to push northwards into the Krishna valley. His aggressive

roused the young Peshwa, Madhab Rao, then in his teens. The latter dealt Haidar a heavy blow at Jadi Hanvati in 1764 and compelled him to flee from the battle-field, disguised and wounded. Madhab Rao sent three other expeditions against Haidar and on each occasion the latter was defeated and compelled to pay indemnities. The premature death of Madhab Rao in 1772 was a great relief to Haidar.

His relations with the English :—Two wars were fought between the English and Haidar Ali. The Madras Government provoked the hostility of Haidar by helping the Nizam in his encroachments on the latter's dominions. This was the First Mysore War. Haidar appeared under the walls of Madras and compelled the English to submit to a treaty dictated by him (1769). The treaty provided for mutual restitution of conquests and reciprocal help in defensive war. (See p. 31). The failure of the English to honour their treaty obligation when Haidar was attacked by the Marathas eventually led to the Second Anglo-Mysore (1780—84). For details See p. 46—47. Haidar ravaged the Carnatic and defeated a detachment under Colonel Baillie. But the tables were turned upon him by the arrival of Sir Eyre Coote who defeated Haidar in three successive engagements. (See p. 47). Haidar, however, died in 1782 in the midst of the war to the great relief of the English.

His character :—He was an able ruler but thoroughly unscrupulous. Though illiterate, he was gifted with great intellectual powers. "He spoke five languages fluently and ordered his affairs with regularity and swift despatch." He ruled by terrorism and personally supervised every detail of his administration.

Tipu Sultan :—Took part in the Second Mysore War and defeated Baithwaite; continued the war after Haidar's death and concluded the Treaty of Mangalore, 1784 (See p. 47). Provoked by Cornwallis he began the Third Mysore War by attacking Travancore in 1789, but was defeated and compelled to cede half of his dominion to the British by Treaty of Seringapattam (See p. 59). Lord Wellesley declared war against him for his intriguing with the French. In the Fourth Mysore War that began he was defeated and killed in 1799. (See p. 65).

Estimate of Tipu Sultan :—Tipu Sultan was the most inveterate and implacable enemy which the English had to encounter in their contest with the Indian Powers. That is why his character and achievements have been widely disparaged by most of the English writers. Lord Cornwallis described him as a "mad barbarian" while Lyall speaks of him as a "fierce, fanatic and ignorant Mohammedan." These remarks are one-sided and they ignore much that was admirable in Tipu's career and character. There is no doubt that Tipu was fierce and fanatic but certainly he was not ignorant. Like his father he could speak fluently Persian, Urdu and Kanaree and his literary taste is shown by the valuable library which he had left behind. Sir John Marriott observes that Tipu displayed a "statesmanlike grasp of the world situation" in sending a mission to Mauritius to propose an alliance with the French to expel the English from India. The miscarriage of the

project does not justify the ridicule usually heaped upon its author, for even so great a man as Napoleon entertained a similar project. He had as much right to try to secure French help to expel the English as the latter had to seek the aid of the Nizam and the Marathas to subdue him. He treated the ryot well and his territory was much better cultivated than the Carnatic and Oudh which under British protection were hastening towards ruin. He was, however, a man full of whims and caprices and introduced many useless innovations in the name of reform. Hence it has been aptly remarked that "Haider was an improving monarch and exhibited few innovations. Tipu was an innovating monarch and made no improvements." He, however, "worked hard at the business of administration and himself wrote instructions on all subjects civil and military." He was a brave soldier but not a good general and he lacked the political sagacity of his father. His patriotism deserves unstinted praise. He might have retained his kingdom by entering into a subsidiary alliance with the English, as the Nizam had done. But he scorned such a humiliating surrender of independence and died, sword in hand, in defending his kingdom.

SELECT UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

India Under East India Company to 1858

1. "Buxar deserves far more than Plassey to be considered as the real origin of the British power in India."—(Agra, 1946, Patna 1940 See p. 24).
2. Discuss the policy of Dupleix. Why did Clive succeed where he failed?—(Patna 1940, See p. 12, 17).
3. Explain the importance of the work of Warren Hastings as Governor of Bengal.—(Annamalai 1950, 1953, See p. 34).
4. Give an account of the Anglo-French struggle in the Carnatic. Discuss the causes of the French failure.—(Annamalai, Patna, 1952 See p. 11—16).
5. Discuss the merits of the political settlement effected by Clive in 1765.—(Annamalai 1952 See p. 28).
6. "It must remain the verdict of history that Cornwallis merely developed under happier auspices what Warren Hastings had begun." Discuss.—(Agra 1947).
7. Show fully how under Lord Wellesley the British empire in India was transformed into the British empire of India.—(Patna 1943 See p. 73).
8. What were the principal defects of the Permanent Settlement? How were they remedied by subsequent enactments?—(Cal. 1951 See p. 57, 133).
9. Discuss Wellesley's North-West Frontier policy and his relations with Oudh.—(Annamalai 1953, Patna 1946 See p. 67).

UNIVERSITY QUESTIONS

10. Discuss the role of Mahadaji Sindhia in Indian history.—(Annamalalai 1951, Agra 1944, See p. 73).
11. Estimate the work of Lord Minto I as Governor-General.—(Annamalalai, 1952, See p. 77).
12. Discuss briefly the influence of the French menace in India on the policy of the British Government from Warren Hastings to Lord Minto I.—(Agra 1946, See p. 63, 68, 79).
13. "The Treaty of Salbai (1782) was neither honourable to the English nor advantageous to their interests." (Lyal) —If so why did Warren Hastings agree to the terms of this Treaty? How did it affect the position of Mahadaji Sindhia and Haidar Ali.—(Agra 1946).
14. Examine the contributions of Raja Ram Mohan Roy to the social and religious progress of India.—(Annamalalai 1953, Agra 1944 See p. 97, 148).
15. Review the relations of Ranjit Singh with the East India Company.—(Annamalalai 1951, Agra 1945, See pp. 78, 95).
16. How far was the foreign policy of the East India Company affected by the fear of a Russian invasion of India?—(Annamalalai, 1951, See p. 95, 99).
17. Show how Lord Hastings completed and consolidated the work of Lord Wellesley.—(Annamalalai 1951 See p. 86).
18. In what respects can the period of British rule in India from 1829 to 1854 be regarded as an epoch of reforms.—(Cal. 1946 See p. 92).
19. Critically examine the trend of the movement for social reform in India between 1813 and 1856.—(Annamalalai 1953, See p. 93).
20. Explain the importance of the Charter Acts of 1813, 1833 and 1853.—(Annamalalai 1951, 1953).
21. Give an estimate of the internal reforms of Lord Dalhousie. How did they react on Indian public mind?—(Patna 1945 See p. 112—114).
22. How did Lord Dalhousie make out a case for the annexation of Oudh? Do you think that his conduct was high-handed and unjust?—(Agra 1947, Annamalalai 1952 See p. 111).
23. Examine the justice of the annexation of Sind.—(Annamalalai 1951, 1950 See p. 103).
24. Discuss the causes and consequences of the Mutiny. Account for its failure.—(Annamalalai 1950, 1952, See p. 116, 123).
25. Review the policy of the British towards Indian States between 1818 and 1856.—(Annamalalai 1953, 1950 See pp. 125—128).
26. Sketch the history of the Ring-Fence policy.—(Annamalalai 1951 See p. 125).
27. The Mutiny may be considered either as a military revolt or as a struggle for recovery of their property and privileges by dispossessed Princes and

land-lords or as an attempt to restore the Mughul Empire. Discuss.—(Agra, 1948 See p. 115—16).

1858 TO THE PRESENT DAY

1. "The rebellion which broke out in 1857 was neither a mutiny nor a national war of independence" Hutchinson. Discuss.—(Agra, 1945, Annamalai 1952 See p. 116).

2. Describe the policy of Masterly Inactivity as pursued by John Lawrence and its consequences.—(Agra 1947 See p. 135—36).

3. Examine the relations between India and Afghanistan between 1862 and 1895.—(Annamalai 1951 See pp. 135—137).

4. Trace the relations between the Government of India and the Indian States from 1875 to 1926.—(Annamalai 1950 See p. 237—38).

5. What steps did Lord Ripon take in the direction of liberalizing the Indian Government?—(Agra, 1948 Annamalai, 1953 See p. 144).

6. Discuss the main constitutional changes that took place during the period—1892—1919.—(Agra, 1948).

7. Explain the circumstances in which the Upper Burma was annexed.—(Annamalai, 1950, 1953 See p. 165).

8. Indicate the main stages in the evolution of educational policy in India till 1921.—(Annamalai, 1950, Agra 1952 See p. 245—46).

9. Give an account of the overhauling of the machinery of administration during Lord Curzon's period of office.—(Annamalai, 1953, Agra 1947).

10. "Most critics are agreed that Lord Curzon, like Lord Dalhousie, whom he resembled in some respects, went too fast"—Explain this and give a critical account of the reforms of Lord Curzon.—(Patna 1946).

11. By what stages was "Provincial Autonomy" achieved? What are the limits set to it by the Indian Constitution to-day?—(Annamalai 1950).

12. Trace the history of India's relations with Tibet during your period.—(Annamalai, 1953 See p. 231).

13. Examine the claims of Raja Rammohan Roy to be regarded as the father of modern India.—(Agra, 1951 See pp. 97, 148).

14. "The second half of the nineteenth century was marked by a strong wave of reforming activities in religion and Society."—Elucidate this Statement.—(Agra, 1951 See p. 148).

15. Describe the part played by India in World War I.—(Annamalai, 1952 See p. 192).

16. Write a note on the organization of Famine Relief in India before 1919. (Annamalai 1952, See p. 244).

17. Give an account of the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the Republic of India. How are they enforced?—(Annamalai, 1953 See pp. 221—222).

18. Write a note on the Freedom of the Press in India Since 1885.—(Annamalai, 1952, Agra, 1949 See p.,99).

Calcutta University Questions 1948—1954

1. What achievements of Wellesley entitle him to a place in the front rank of the British rulers of India?—1948 (See p. 73).

2. In what respects does the administration of Ripon form a salient point in the history of Indian reform?—1948 (See p. 144—147).

3. Give an account of the progressive realisation of responsible Government in British India in your period.—1948 (See pp. 169, 182, 187).

4. "In spite of his final failure, Dupleix is a striking and brilliant figure in Indian history." What are the real claims of the French statesman to greatness?—1949 (See p. 17, 12).

5. Attempt a critical review of the internal reforms of Cornwallis. Do you agree that his land settlement was a great blunder?—(See pp. 54—57).

6. Estimate the services rendered by Warren Hastings to the growth and consolidation of the British power in India.—(See pp. 50—51).

7. Give an account of the social and administrative reforms of Lord William Bentinck, and discuss his place in the history of modern India—1950 (See p. 93—95).

8. Criticize the policy of the Afghan wars and the solution of the Afghan problem during the second half of the nineteenth century.—(See p. 134—37).

9. In what manner did Lord Ripon help the growth of ideas about democracy and self-government in India?—1950 (See p. 145—46).

10. Sketch the history of the Anglo-Maratha relations in the last quarter of the 18th century.—See pp. 87—88).

11. What were the principal defects of the Permanent Settlement? How were they remedied by subsequent enactments?—(See p. 57, 132, 166).

12. Critically review the measures adopted by Lord Dalhousie for the strengthening of the British power in India.—1951 (See p. 109—112).

13. Discuss the foreign policy of Lord Curzon.—(See p. 172—74).

14. Examine the judicial and revenue reforms of Warren Hastings.—1952

15. What part did Lord Wellesley play in the establishment of British power in India?—1951 (See p. 63, 73).

16. Give a short account of Anglo-Afghan relations during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Auckland and Lord Ellenborough.—1951 (See p. 99—102).

17. Describe the causes of the failure of the first organised rising ('the Mutiny') against British rule in India. What were its immediate effects?—1952 (See p. 122—23).

Write notes on :—

- (a) 'Annexation of the Punjab' (b) Bentinck's measures for social reform. (c) Lord Ripon's measures for local self-government; (d) Lord Curzon's north-eastern frontier policy; (e) 'Montague-Chemsford Reforms'.—1952.

19. Give a brief but systematic account of the Anglo-French struggle for Supremacy in the Deccan.—1953 (See p. 11—14).

20. What measures were adopted by Lord Dalhousie for the aggrandisement of the British power in India?—1953 (P. 109—112).

21. Give a brief account of Lord Curzon's administration in India.—1953. (See p. 172—76).

Write notes on :—

- (a) Revenue reforms of Lord Cornwallis. (b) Anglo-Afghan relations during Lord Auckland's Governor-Generalship. (c) The Annexation of Sind. (d) The Government of India Act, 1935.—1953.

23. Describe the plans of Dupleix. Why did they fail?—1954 (See p. 16).

24. Give an estimate of Warren Hastings as Governor-General—1954 (See p. 50—51).

25. Enumerate the achievements of Ranjit Singh.—1954 (See p. 78 and App. D).

26. Discuss the Afghan policy of Lord Lytton. Write a note on the Second Anglo-Afghan war.—1954 (See p. 141).

